00067701

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

ANGLICAN CHURCH PORTRAITS.

ANGLICAN

CHURCH PORTRAITS.

67701

J. G. ROGERS, B.A.

London:

JAMES CLARKE & CO., 13, FLEET STREET.

1876.

283
Rog/Ang-
67701

PREFACE.

THESE sketches originally appeared in the pages of the *Congregationalist*, and are now republished at the suggestion of many friends. All of these have been carefully revised, and some partly re-written. It may at first sight seem presumptuous in one who cannot pretend to an intimate personal acquaintance with any of the dignitaries who are their subjects, to venture on the kind of portraiture which is here attempted; but, perhaps, the very absence of this kind of knowledge is rather advantageous than otherwise, when the object is simply to deal with the public life of these ecclesiastics. I have written, of course, as a Nonconformist, and have not hesitated to show how far the position and conduct of the chief pastors of the Anglican Church seem to be affected for good or evil by their relations to the Establishment. I believe that, with but few exceptions, the influence has been eminently injurious, and that the men would have been nobler and greater had they not been fettered by the restrictions of the State Church. Its honours have been glittering, but cumbrous chains. Their wearers have been hampered not only by positive regulations, but also by the necessity of caring for the safety

of the Establishment under the complicated conditions in which it at present exists. Perhaps the Church of England has not had, at any period of her history, a Bench of Bishops more entitled to honour for their personal qualities, and yet there has never been one subject to more scathing criticism. The reason is, that the difficulties of the Establishment never were so great; and the attempts of the Bishops to harmonise contending forces, which every day become more irreconcilable, expose them to suspicions and censures alike from every party in Church and State. How far their own policy has justified this treatment, these sketches may help their readers to judge. My chief aim has been to show that it is possible to be a strong opponent of a system, and yet to have a sincere admiration for many of the men who are identified with it. It is too commonly thought that those who feel themselves conscientiously bound to seek the removal of the Establishment are influenced mainly by an envy or jealousy of its bishops and clergy, which prevents them from recognising their high personal excellence, or duly appreciating the great work they are doing. If this little volume does anything to remove this impression, it will not have been published in vain.

J. G. R.

Clapham, May 18, 1876.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Primate	1
The Archbishop of York	33
The Dean of Westminster	59
The Bishop of Durham	89
Canon Pusey	112
The Bishop of Exeter	159
The Late Canon Kingsley	185
The Bishop of Lincoln	205
The Bishop of Manchester	228
The Bishop of Carlisle	259
Canon Liddon	283
The Late Bishop of St. David's	304
The Late Bishop of Winchester	323
The Bishop of London	353

LIBRARY
OF THE
BOMBAY
BRANCH
OF THE

ANGLICAN CHURCH PORTRAITS.

THE PRIMATE.

THE position of an English Primate is not one greatly to be desired by a man of very definite and pronounced theological opinions, or of deep spiritual sympathies. At first sight, indeed, it might seem as if an Episcopal divine, sincerely attached to his Church, and prepared to accept the responsibility which leadership must necessarily entail, could aspire to no office more worthy of a legitimate ambition, or more likely to afford an extended sphere of Christian labour and influence than that which an Archbishop of Canterbury, the ecclesiastical head of the most wealthy and powerful of Protestant communities, enjoys. A comparatively short experience of the Primacy, however, would show him the wide difference between the appearance and the reality, and, if he were an earnest man, might probably cause him to look back with regret to the humbler position he had left for an elevation in which he would find himself hampered by innumerable restraints, exposed to perpetual misunderstanding and criticism, and with

that power for good which he had vainly hoped to enjoy limited on every side.

In a discussion in Convocation on the increase of the Episcopate, the present Primate reminded his brethren that they were officers of the State as well as the Church; and the fact is one which he has no doubt constantly to bear in mind. An Erastian system, like that of our National Establishment, cannot always work smoothly. Occasional collisions between the rival powers of Church and State are almost inevitable, and it requires no little skill on the part of the representative of the spiritual force to prevent them from leading to mischievous results. It is his to moderate the zeal of strong Churchmen on the one side, and to arrest any attempt at encroachment on the part of statesmen on the other, and, if possible, to avoid that friction so trying to a machinery very delicate and loosely held together. The task is not pleasant, and its difficulty is indefinitely increased by the intestine divisions of the Church. An Archbishop can hardly be supposed to be devoid of party leanings, yet he has to keep them in subordination to his care for the general interests, and so, in his attempts to preserve impartiality, expose himself to misconstruction by former friends, who may fancy that his new dignity has induced a coolness to his old principles.

The one point which Premiers keep in view in the selection of Primates is to choose safe men, without strong party prepossessions, or with the power of holding them in check when prudence required; men

with sufficient understanding of the signs of the times, and enough of sympathy with their spirit, to keep them from an unwise assertion of ecclesiastical claims—too prudent to attempt violent changes, however desirable they might be in themselves—too calm and dignified to become partisans, and so embroil the Church in new conflicts. It would not be difficult to point to men who have sat on the Episcopal Bench, to say nothing of such extreme Churchmen as Archdeacon Denison, whom no statesman, whatever his private views as to their abilities and qualifications, would venture to place on the throne of Canterbury. "*In medio tutus ibis*" is the law which a primate is expected to obey, and no one will be called to the position who does not seem likely to conform to it. A man of another temper would fret against the necessary restraints under which he would feel himself, and might even seek to grasp at more power for the Church. If, then, our rulers wish to preserve the existing relations between the Church and the State undisturbed, they are wise in their generation in appointing only men who, if they have decision and energy, keep them under the control of a sound judgment, and use them chiefly in works of practical Christianity.

The Primate is pre-eminently a man of this type. The determination to have safe men has very often resulted in the appointment of second-rate men. But this is by no means the case in the present instance. The Anglican Church can boast few divines of clearer head than Dr. Tait. He is too broad in

his views to be a partisan, too cautious to act with precipitation; too cool to allow himself ever to be carried away by impulse; too sound in his judgment ever to abuse the strength he possesses. A more intelligent, far-sighted, judicious man has not for some time been Primate. His experience of men and things has been varied, and he has known how to profit by the opportunities he has enjoyed, so that he unites to the learning of the divine the practical wisdom of a man of the world. He has the proverbial sagacity of his nation, and it has been sharpened by the knowledge of men he must have acquired as a College Tutor at Oxford, the Head-master of Rugby, the Dean of Carlisle, and the Bishop of London. Many Churchmen would say that he has been without the most important training of all, that of parochial work; but even this is only partially true, for in a small city like Carlisle, the Dean, if he be disposed for active labours, as Dr. Tait always was, gains a good deal of parochial experience.

To outsiders it seems strange that the Episcopal Bench should be so often recruited from great schools or colleges, rather than from great parishes. The complaints of many Churchmen, and especially of the Ritualists, on this score, are not without reason; and yet it must be confessed that some of these tutors and schoolmasters make excellent bishops. No doubt the life of a parish helps a clergyman, if he enters into it heartily and discharges it wisely, to acquire a better knowledge of

the actual condition of society, and the practical hindrances to the work of the Church; but the wider culture which the head of a great school must have, and the more comprehensive views which his more independent position and his freedom from those warping and narrowing influences which often tell so powerfully and injuriously upon a local magnate, enable him to take, compensate for many deficiencies. The head-masters of our public schools are the most liberal section of the clergy; and probably it is on the whole to the advantage of the Anglican Church that so many of her bishops have been taken from so learned a body. The objections made, and the dislike felt to them, by many of the parochial clergy, are quite intelligible. Their very appointment may seem to imply a slight on the office of the parish priest; and perhaps, at the beginning of their career, a tendency to regard the best of their clergy as though they were their old sixth, and to lecture those who may cross their path as though they were insubordinates of the lower forms, strengthens the prejudice against them. There were many who said that even to the end of his days the first Bishop of Manchester never wholly cast aside the ideas and habits he had contracted at King Edward VI.'s School at Birmingham. Of course where this is so it is extremely unfortunate, but the head-masters of the best type have more of the spirit of the statesman, and in general are so much in advance of their class, as to suggest the thought that it is not clerical orders, but the status of

the parish priest which makes the clergy generally so illiberal. It is certainly well for the Church herself that her chief rulers should not be men who have gained their ideas of the state of the nation, and especially of the position Dissent holds in it, from the experience of some small village, in which, as rectors, they have reigned supreme, and where, in their aristocratic isolation, they have known nothing of the work which, though conducted by humble men whom they would not have cared to notice, has yet been going on under the very shadow of their rectory, and greatly to the advantage of their parish.

Dr. Tait, happily for his Church, has not seen England through such a medium as this. It is not possible, perhaps, for a man trained as he has been, to view the relations of Church and Nonconformity as they appear to Nonconformists, or even to a perfectly unprejudiced observer. But he does not look at them in the spirit of a self-complacent aristocratic rector, who succeeded to the family living as his elder brother succeeded to the family acres, and undertook the care of the souls in his parish with the same perfect self-possession that the other took the beeves on the estate, who regards Dissent as an insolent and vulgar rebellion against authority, and who, if he had the power, would stamp it out in the same fashion as his bucolic brother deals with the cattle plague. He is a man of independent judgment; for though he is an optimist in respect to his Church, and as loyal and devoted a son

and as able a champion as she can boast, he has a breadth and liberality of sentiment which saves him from sinking into the bigot. The discipline of affliction, of which he has had large and bitter experience, has evidently told upon his character, mellowing and softening it, and those who differ most widely from his opinions as a theologian, or are most disposed to resent his claims as a prelate, must recognise and admire the true-hearted piety and amiable spirit of the man. Where he is best known, the best respect for his personal goodness and the simplicity and beauty of his Christian life is deepest.

It is not as a private Christian, however, but as a prelate, that the Archbishop is to be considered here. Possibly there are not many who would regard him as an ideal Bishop, and yet he does great credit to the wisdom of those by whom he was selected, and, taken altogether, is perhaps as good a Primate as the Anglican Church could have found in her ranks. He is by no means a colourless theologian, for in his earlier days he was one of the four Oxford Tutors whose historic protest against Tract 90 marks an era in the Anglo-Catholic movement; and though in his present position he seeks to preserve impartiality, he has given sufficient proof that he looks unfavourably upon the Romanising party; while they, on their side, show that they fully appreciate the strength of his antagonism by the singular bitterness with which they assail him.

At the same time he knows how to steer clear of everything that could be construed into a partisan proceeding, and, in fact, sometimes awakens suspicion on both sides from the moderation with which he pursues the even tenor of his way. This moderation is very far from being the first of Christian virtues, but in his case it is an essential one. It demands such nice calculations of the strength of opposing forces, such careful attention to the winds and currents of public opinion and circumstance, such anxious forecasting of the possible consequences of any line of action, and in general so much of the policy which is more worthy of a statesman than a Christian minister, that it must be fatal to all enthusiasm. Still it is a cardinal merit in an English Primate, and Dr. Tait undoubtedly possesses it in a high degree. He is naturally cautious; his own tendencies, notwithstanding strong sympathies with Evangelical doctrines, are decidedly to the Broad Church party; he is a strong believer in the comprehensiveness of his Church, and thus by temperament and conviction, as well as by the exigencies of his position, he is disposed to cultivate that judicial impartiality by the absence of which an Archbishop of Canterbury might very soon involve his Church in inextricable confusion, and even precipitate its fall. No one can suppose him uninterested in the controversies of the day; and the surprising thing is, that one who evidently has decided opinions and sympathies should yet have been able, to so great an extent, to steer clear alike of Scylla and Charybdis. The

fierceness which has recently marked the intestine controversies of the Establishment has, indeed, rendered it impossible for him to maintain a neutral ground. Instead of keeping the middle path, he has been carried alternately to one or the other side; but he has taken care not to be borne too far in either direction. A man of this temper could never have been a great ecclesiastical leader. He would never have attempted any daring innovation; and it is doubtful whether, on the other side, he would be strong enough to resist a powerful party intent on working out changes which he might disapprove. But there are few men more capable of holding the balance between contending schools fairly; and if the object is simply to preserve peace as long as possible, there is no one to whom the task could be more safely trusted.

His moderation, too, it must be remembered, is all the more effective because it is not the fruit of a cold, apathetic, or indolent nature. In an age of strong feeling and stirring life like the present, a Primate who simply sought his own ease and consoled himself amid the strife around him with the feeling that he at least should die in his nest, would secure the impartial contempt of all parties. But the very opposite of this is the character of Archbishop Tait. He is an earnest, energetic, laborious man; but his earnestness, instead of developing itself in controversy, is shown in an untiring activity in the work of his diocese. His administration of the See of London was eminently successful, and

will long be remembered, because of the impetus which his personal example, as well as his teaching, gave to the work of Church extension in the very place where it was most needed, and where, at the same time, it was most difficult to carry it out to an extent commensurate with the wants of the population. The skill with which he reduced to order a diocese which he found in a state of considerable disorganisation, the new life which he infused into the whole work of the Church, and especially the ability and energy which he showed in the creation and working of the Church Building Fund, all proved him to be a man of true zeal and great administrative capacity. But nothing, perhaps, produced such an impression of his personal devotion to his work as his visits to the cholera hospitals during the visitation of 1866. In fact, ever since he was called to the Episcopate he has shown that for him it could never be a sinecure or a place of dignified ease, but must be a sphere of hard and constant work. The moderation of spirit of one who has his heart so thoroughly in his work that his health has suffered and his life been endangered by the manner in which he has taxed himself, must command a respect which would not have been accorded to it if he had been nothing more than an ecclesiastical *roi faineant*.

The period of his London Episcopate was the most honourable, as we should think it must have been the happiest, time in his life. Then, as ever, he had a keen eye to the advance of his Church.

It was chiefly in aggressive Christian work that he was engaged, and all that a conscientious desire to make his power a stimulus and example in every part of his vast diocese could do, was done. He was fertile in suggestions and abundant in labours; as careful in the working out of details as in the preparation of great plans; desirous always to show how deeply he sympathised in the cares and labours of his brethren. Happily for himself, he had not yet to shape the policy of a Church. What was required was practical wisdom and energy, and these qualities he developed fully.

But these are hardly the attributes which are most necessary for a Primate in our days. We are living in times when controversy no longer turns upon speculative questions or subordinate points of doctrine and practice, but has to do with vital principles, and is carried on with a vehemence and determination which indicate that the character of the Anglican Church will be materially affected by the issue. The Ritualist party are as lawless in their spirit as they are extreme in their opinions. Their hearts are set upon making the Anglican Church "Catholic," that is, to all practical purposes, Romanist. If the law is on their side, they will avail themselves of it to the utmost extent; if the law is against them, so much the worse for the law. In either case they will stand by their own position, and carry out their own ideas. When the Rubrics can be made to tell in their favour they will quote them against the Evan-

gelicals, whom they will reproach for disloyalty and disobedience. When, on the contrary, the Courts declare that the Rubrics are against themselves, they will repudiate Courts and Rubrics alike, and declare that they own only the higher law of Christ.

Now an evil like this is just the thing with which an Archbishop was bound to deal, and to deal promptly and effectively; but his manner of treating it from first to last has been one lamentable display of weakness. Whatever might be his private opinion as to the merits of the controversy, it was his duty to rebuke and suppress every attempt of the clergy to set themselves above the law. But this is exactly what he has not done. After the decisions in the Mackonochie and Purchas cases, it might have been thought that a stop would have been put to practices which are a scandal to a Protestant Church. But those judgments were allowed to become practically a dead letter; and the numbers of churches in which lighted candles stood on the altars, and incense was burned, the host elevated, and genuflections and prostrations practised, often in a fashion which surpassed the most extreme developments of Rome, were as many, if they were not more, than before the decisions were given. To an even greater extent—because here the Ritualists had the sympathy of less advanced High Churchmen—the officiating priests set aside the Rubric which, as expounded by the highest ecclesiastical court in the land, requires them to stand at the north side of the altar while offering the consecration prayer.

A parallel to the wanton and contemptuous defiance of the law which followed the Purchas decision could not easily be found. Numbers of the clergy simply announced their intention to disobey—some on the ground that the judgment was not sound (an idea which is very apt to occur to disappointed suitors), and others because a civil tribunal had overridden what they were pleased to consider the law of the Church. The outburst was all the more significant because of the distinguished names of some who were at the head of this clerical conspiracy to assert independence of the State. It was a crying scandal, and one which a Primate ought to have firmly repressed. Mere policy should have led him to do it; for this spirit of rebellion is fostered by indulgence, and sooner or later it must provoke a collision, the results of which it is impossible to calculate. The rapid development of Romanism in the Establishment is a phenomenon on which all thoughtful men look with feelings of alarm, and with which no wise ruler would trifle. It has been wonderfully helped by the impunity which those who are working for it enjoy, and for that impunity the Primate is largely answerable. His Episcopal brethren, indeed, must share the responsibility; but he is their recognised head, and should have originated measures for the repression of so serious and growing an evil long before it attained such dimensions. So long, indeed, as the law had not pronounced, the position of the priest at the altar might have been treated as one of those doubtful

and indifferent points on which the Church allowed liberty. But when the highest Court in the land had pronounced a decision only to elicit from some thousands of the clergy a declaration that they would not obey it, and when two men so eminent as Canons Gregory and Liddon expressly intimated to their Bishop their intention not to comply with its requirements, and called upon him to prosecute them for their contumacy, the question took a new form, and one which demanded a much sterner mode of treatment than that which Dr. Tait adopted, and that the Archbishop should have recognised. He might have been willing, even desirous, to grant the widest liberty; but it was a very different thing to look with complacency on an act of rebellion against the law. Instead, however, of breasting he bent before the storm. The party was too powerful to be defied, and therefore he sought to conciliate and soothe; and the letter in which he sought to calm down the excited feelings of Mr. Purchas's friends, by assuring them of the determination of the bishops to be lenient and moderate in enforcing the law, was a sad example of amiable weakness, if, indeed, it was not something worse. Under such circumstances, moderation is not the quality which the Church requires most in her Primate. A spirit of decision and courage would be at least equally valuable, and the time may not be far distant when the best friends of the Church may regret that our Archbishop did not show more of those harder qualities in dealing

with the Ritualistic party, in what may prove to have been the crisis of the fight.

The view of the comprehensiveness of the Church, which his Grace developed with great care in his first Charge, did not present any defence of his conduct in thus conniving at a positive breach of the law, but it describes his own ecclesiastical position very clearly. No one could have put the case of Latitudinarianism more forcibly, and the very ability with which he advocates his view only serves to exhibit more clearly its essential weakness. "The ideal of our Church," he says, "is this: that men who agree in the grand essentials of Christianity, who reverence the Lord Jesus Christ in His Divine nature as our Lord and Saviour, who look to His purifying blood as the atonement for their sins, who confess themselves to have no hope of salvation without His death and passion, who point to the written word of God as the test by which all our doctrines are to be tried—such men should, as far as possible, be united in one communion; and I trust that as men become earnest in the great duties of their calling, they will more and more realise such truths." Now, so far as a National Church is concerned, even this does not mark out the full extent to which, if the advocates of Latitudinarianism are to be true to their own principles, its comprehensiveness should reach. It should, in fact, have no tests, and know no conditions of fellowship; but room should be found for every man who is willing to be of it. Whether a broad

and Catholic Church could be constituted on such a basis as that which the Archbishop indicates, is another question. A religious establishment, if it is to be perfectly equitable, must certainly be constructed on lines that are much broader still.

But the Archbishop is not consistent with himself, for, when laying down these Catholic principles, he insists that there are barriers which must separate Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Independents and Pædo-Baptists, and Anti-Pædo-Baptists; and he is so far from asserting that the Anglican Church should open its doors to every citizen, whatever may be his theological opinions, that he says: "I am not going to maintain that there ought to be room for every man in the Church of England for whom there is room in heaven." It is not that he looks upon Protestant Dissenters with any feelings of narrow bigotry: for, instead of sympathising with those who crave for a closer ecclesiastical fellowship with Episcopal Churches on the Continent, he looks longingly towards "so many of our brethren at home from whom we are estranged;" and in a spirit of true charity writes: "Every effort which can be made to unite us more truly in the bonds of Christian love with these our brethren at home, seems to come to us recommended by something more practical than is found in efforts to unite us with foreigners, many of whom show little inclination to admit us to their fellowship! some of whom could not admit us without our denying the great principles of our Reformed

Church. I am no visionary, looking forward to a time when all the various denominations throughout Britain are to come and desire admission into the Church of England; but still I trust, if we persevere in the loving, faithful discharge of our duty, if we adhere faithfully to the formularies which we have received from the time of the Reformation, and if we show in all things where we can, without any compromise of principle, a hearty spirit of Christian love, there is every hope that, in Christ's good time, the differences that keep us apart may disappear."

The Archbishop is a sanguine as well as a charitable man, if he really expects the removal of the differences which at present separate Churchmen and Dissenters. A time may, it is to be hoped will, come when all parties will receive a fuller baptism of charity, but it is hardly probable that alienation of feeling and diversities of opinion will cease. Nor are Dissenters at all likely to accept the position which he would assign them, as the friends of a Church in which, as there is no room in it for those who do not believe in bishops and priests, they can have no place, but which is still to remain the Church of the nation. Perhaps, however, the friendly feeling he shows to us is as much as we could reasonably expect from a Primate. No man has more excuse for believing that "the Church" is the best of all possible Churches in the best of all possible worlds, and for failing to recognise the force of the objec-

tions which Dissenters urge against it. If he has succeeded in persuading himself that the Church is as independent of the State which installed him in the Primacy as are Dissenting communities; if he is insensible to the injury to which religion is exposed from the contradictory utterances which the Church gives on every great question of Christian doctrine, the "Gospel of peradventures" which she preaches to the people; if he is so blind to the sign of the times as to indulge the expectation that the Anglican Church, "with more or less of its present constitution, will last till the Lord comes;" if some of his ideas in relation to Nonconformists are hardly just, and his idea that a Church can, in any true sense, be national, which excludes on principle all who do not acknowledge the divine right of bishops, it must not be forgotten that he is a Primate, and that to him everything Episcopal will present itself in the brightest colour.

This archiepiscopal Charge was an indication of a lack either of the clearness of view or the strength of will necessary in a ruler at such a crisis. It trifled with the tendencies it should have firmly repressed, and, despite all its breadth, gave the sacerdotal party quite as much encouragement as they could have reasonably hoped for. It showed the Primate comprehensive, so far as the interests of the Establishment required, and beyond that as rigid as any could desire, going so far as to say, "Of course, there are points on which, if men differ, it is impossible that they can be united in the same

communion." He is practically right, but he deals a death-blow to the idea of a comprehensive Establishment by such an assertion, as assuredly he does a good deal to strengthen the Ritualist position by his ideas of the differences which are compatible with the maintenance of Christian communion and those which render it impossible. "All who know the history of the discussions of former ages, to say nothing of our own, grant that it is totally impossible to have in the same Church persons who cannot do without bishops, and persons who can do without bishops." But why impossible? It might have been said before the experiment was tried that it was impossible the same Church could contain those who believed the adoration of the Host to be idolatry, and those who believed the Christian ritual to be incomplete without it. If, contrary to all reasonable anticipations, they can remain in the same Church, provided it be established, why might not Presbyterians and Episcopalians come into like relations? So again: "If one man holds that infants ought to be baptized, and another that they ought not, it is a very difficult matter indeed to suppose that they can be united in the same communion." But where is the difficulty? So far is the impossibility of union from being self-evident, that the only wonder with many is that Christian brethren should remain separated from each other on such trivial grounds. Nonconformists, however, thank the Archbishop for the tacit admission here. His reasoning at least neutralises the charge of schism so

often brought against them; for if men with such differences of opinion cannot remain in the same Church, they must of necessity form separate communions. The puzzle is, how to understand the theory of comprehensiveness which would keep in the same Church men who have vital differences as to the efficacy of baptism, but refuse to believe in the possibility of union between those who differ as to the period of life at which baptism should be administered. It is needless to point out how much such a view tells in favour of those who believe in Apostolical Succession and Baptismal Regeneration.

Looking back to the Charge, it must be said that if an amiable spirit and kindly words could have delivered the Church from the evil which menaced her very existence then (1872), as it does still, the Primate would have accomplished the task. But what was necessary was a decided line of action, not fair speech, and, in the absence of that, the mischief only increased, until at length the Archbishop was compelled to assume a position from which he evidently shrank. The speech with which he startled the House of Peers on the introduction of the Public Worship Bill is hardly forgotten yet. It awakened in Protestants throughout the country the hope (alas! as yet but imperfectly fulfilled) that the Primate was at last determined to crush the conspiracy which, on his own showing, was seeking to Romanise the Church. It irritated Ritualists to such a pitch that henceforth they have been, if possible, more virulent in their hatred of, and more

unscrupulous in their attacks on, the Primate than ever. But, unfortunately, it did little else, for the proposals it introduced were as feeble as it was vehement. The lawlessness and disorder it described had become so extreme, that not only was there need for interference of the Legislature, but it was necessary that it should be of the most uncompromising character. But for this the Primate was not prepared, and by his hesitations and uncertainty he increased the difficulties of the situation.

Of course laws could not be made to please the advocates of a narrow and restrictive policy; but as the great majority of Anglicans are sober, rational people, who understand the rule of live and let live, are far more anxious about the security of the Establishment than the triumph of their sectional views, and above all things hate that extravagance which is the root of all evil, there could be no difficulty in preparing and passing a law which would meet their wishes and at the same time suffice for the suppression of Ritualist extremes. An exclusive measure was the very last thing to be contemplated, for as the Church is built on a foundation of compromise, as, according to the Bishop of Peterborough, "compromise" is written all over the Prayer-Book, and as from the first she has included opposite "schools" whose first concern, after discharging their primary and common duty to the Establishment, seems to be the weakening of each other, it would be folly to attempt anything so wild and revolutionary as the establish-

ment of unity even in a Church which is governed by an Act of Uniformity. Such insane devices as the enforcement of the Rubrics, the requirement of absolute obedience to the law on the part of the clergy, and in general an appeal to the Prayer-Book and Articles as standards, to the letter of which there must be absolute conformity, might be entertained by extreme reformers; but the Primate and his Bishops were far too wise to show such fanaticism about the law. All that they desired to do was to put a check on the violence of men whose transgressions were becoming too flagrant to be tolerated. As the Bishop of Peterborough explained to his diocesan synod, while the majority of all the three schools of thought "are exceedingly remarkable for their obedience and their submission to the laws of the Rubric," there is a "very small minority in all schools who are not submissive to or heedful of the law." Thus there is a Broad Churchman who plainly declares he will not read the Athanasian Creed; an Evangelical clergyman has been guilty of the atrocious sin of preaching in Dissenting chapels, and, what is worse, replies to his Bishop—that pattern of milk-and-water feebleness miscalled meekness, the Bishop of London—in a tone of "insolent defiance;" while as to the High Church, there is a large section whose contempt of law is too patent to need proof, who boldly declare that "they will not obey the law when the unwritten instinct of the Church comes in the way," and who cheer the sentiment that "an

incumbent ought to be a bishop in his own church, and subject to no authority whatever"—a most remarkable opinion, it must be confessed, for an Episcopalian divine. These are the men it was meant to suppress, and as the centres were very large, and as their members agreed in disliking these extremes, there could, it was supposed, be no insuperable obstacle to the accomplishment of so desirable an end. So had the Primate and his colleagues been repeatedly assured, and they seem to have believed it.

Those who reasoned thus, and supposed that moderate men of all schools would have such confidence in the impartiality of the bishops that they would trust them to hold the balances, and leave the determination of ritual virtually at their discretion, as the Primate's Bill originally proposed, had but little knowledge of human nature, and still less of the intensity of the feelings these ecclesiastical controversies had aroused. Their views were those of men up in a balloon, who had taken no means of acquainting themselves with the state of opinion in this mundane sphere; and the result proved how sadly they had miscalculated. Possibly if he could have had the knowledge which the bitter experience of the discussions has given him, the Archbishop might have tolerated the excesses of the Ritualists a little longer, and, what was harder, have endured even their insolence; quietly submitted to the taunts directed against rulers whom none would obey and leaders whom none would follow;

and have accepted, with as much grace as it was possible to command, a situation sufficiently mortifying, rather than have dared the perils he has now to encounter. He failed, in fact, in all that he attempted to do, and the Bill which was passed, mainly by the force of the Protestant furor of the Commons, bore but slight resemblance to that which he proposed. Lord Shaftesbury, while a zealot on behalf of the Church, has been one of the keenest censors of the bishops; and yet the Primate had the annoyance of seeing the House of Lords adopt the scheme of the Evangelical earl in preference to his own, and of finding that resolution approved by the more independent and able portion of the press, and even by numbers of the clergy. The Primate would have given the bishops more power; Lord Shaftesbury's scheme took away from them even the little they had, and in effect superseded their jurisdiction in their own dioceses. "The Bill," said the *Saturday Review*, "as it stands, after Lord Shaftesbury's and Lord Cairns' manipulation, confiscates the judicial attributes which the bishops have held ever since the first rise of the English Church, some thirteen hundred years ago, in favour of a single lawyer, to be appointed by the two Archbishops, only checked by the Government of the day." The change, be it wise or foolish, is revolutionary, and is a strange one to be brought about by the intervention of a Primate.

The blind trust in law and in courts which the

whole of these proceedings revealed, is, however, only an illustration of the benumbing influence of a State Church. Men become so accustomed to lean on authority that they lose faith in truth, faith in spiritual force, unless supplemented by some external help; faith in the Bible, unless the imprimatur of Parliament is on it; even faith in God Himself, unless the State will proclaim His authority and enforce His law. And so in this enlightened century, what the able and devoted clergy attached to Protestant principles, and zealous in their defence, have not been able to effect, what Protestant truth itself cannot be trusted to accomplish by its own inherent power, is to be done by the Provincial Courts of the two Archbishops instituted expressly for the purpose. The Bishop is reduced to a nonentity, except, indeed, that a certain discretion is left to him as to permitting law-suits; but the new judge—who, as the *Saturday Review* wittily put it, will metamorphose "the club-room of the 'Three Jolly Pigeons' into the 'Provincial Court of the Most Reverend Father in God, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury"—will take his place and administer the law by which the unity, if not the orthodoxy, of the Church is to be maintained. "We know," added the *Review*, "on the authority of Lord Shaftesbury, endorsed by the docile Archbishops, that this process will ensure the peace of the Church; only we confess to being compelled to take the statement on faith." In short, the fire is left to burn on, and no attempt

is made even to remove combustible materials; but we are to have a new fire-engine, constructed after the Shaftesbury patent model.

The discussions in the House of Lords on the Bill must sometimes have sorely tried the Primate's temper. Occasionally he showed his irritation. Thus, when Lord Oranmore introduced the unwelcome subject of the Confessional, the Archbishop was so peevish and petulant as to betray a consciousness of the weakness and inconsistency of his position. In his opening speech, the introduction of confessional boxes in the churches was one of the darkest features in the picture, and it might reasonably have been expected that the Bill would have done something to counteract an evil whose existence and seriousness had been quoted as one of the reasons for proposing it. But when Lord Oranmore ventured to suggest that an "incumbent who has used such practice of the confessional as is not contemplated in such book (the book of Common Prayer)," should be liable to prosecution, the Archbishop turned on him with considerable sharpness, and, as the Ritualist papers of course think, with considerable *naïveté* also, with the answer that "the Bill was one for the regulation of public worship, and he did not know that the noble lord could show that the practice of confession was a part of public worship." Technically, no doubt, he was right, and yet Lord Oranmore might be pardoned if he thought that, if it was a subject which was in place in the Primate's speech it

could not altogether be irrelevant to the object of the Bill.

The objection is only too characteristic of the Primate. Nonconformists would be sorry to speak of him as do some journals in his own Church, one of which tells us that "it is impossible for the most charitable critic to give him credit for religious motives." The integrity, purity, and, to a certain extent, the religiousness of his motives are unquestionable; but they are the motives of one who holds the principles of pure Erastianism. He has no appreciation of the strength of the convictions ranged on either side—is disposed rather to regard their intensity as a sign of weakness or fanaticism—and, from the fact that he looks down on the strifes they engender with sublime indifference, or curious and mystified perplexity, is utterly incompetent to settle them. It needs some enthusiasm to realise the position of enthusiasts, but of enthusiasm the Primate has not a spark, unless, indeed, his zeal on behalf of the Establishment, which has heaped such honours upon him, is to be so described. Moderation is his idol, and he worships it with such sincerity and devotion that he cannot understand how there can be any who do not share his sentiments. Evangelicalism is good if it be not pushed to extremes; and Anglicanism is good if it be not arrogant in its temper and extravagant in its ceremonial; and he would give both a shelter in the Establishment under the benevolent guidance of himself and others of like spirit, who are too wise to attach any im-

portance to the peculiarities of either; but he hardly understands the earnestness of partisans on both sides, and, above all, has no tolerance for extremes. It is surely a singular fate that has placed on the throne of Canterbury at a juncture like this a divine whose amiability is as freely confessed by his foes as his feebleness is deplored by his friends; who has not the ardour of a zealot nor yet the worldly wisdom of a politician; who will neither throw himself on the devotion of his clergy, and trust them to sustain him in the adoption of a decided policy, which might secure the spiritual independence of the Church and her right to enforce her own discipline, nor, on the other hand, boldly carry out the Erastian theory he holds and employ the power of the State to bring about the compromise he desires; who is bent on saving the Establishment, and yet, from want of sagacity and decision, pursues a course which is full of danger to its interests, and the effect of which has been to expose him to the attacks of all parties.

The conduct of the Primate since the passing of the Public Worship Act has only given fresh proof of his inability as a captain or pilot. It is to be said that the fault is not wholly his. The task he has to perform is one which might certainly task a man of iron will, and the most far-seeing intellect. The ship is labouring in the trough of the sea, and the force of the waves is so great that the difficulty of extricating her is almost impossible. An Establishment which commands the admiration of the

Bishop of Lincoln on the one hand, and Mr. Matthew Arnold on the other, and seems to be almost equally acceptable to the prelate who believes in Catholic traditions, and the litterateur who treats some of the most precious truths of the Gospel as mere *aberglaube*, may be supposed by some on this very account to possess manifold merits. But the secret of the strange concert of opinion in men so opposite is, that the Establishment will not avow its true character, and each one believes it to be what he himself desires. Of course, this immensely increases the difficulties of rulers who have to take care that the mask is not so far dropped as to show either party that he is mistaken, and that the institution is a very different thing from what he has been accustomed to suppose.

So has it been with Archbishop Tait. When the Public Worship Act was passed, the mask was uplifted so far as to show certain Protestant features, and there was a jubilant cry throughout Evangelical circles, and an anxious waiting for the time when the dogs of the law might be unleashed and set upon the Romanising traitors. But this was hardly what the Primate wished, or, at all events, not what he thought safe, and so at Maidstone an effort was made to repair the error. "He could not help thinking that it was very unwise to push people further than they desired to go in the maintenance of opinions; we should rather try to modify them, and in the course of time the effect

of that reaction which was going on in almost every mind would lead them to look at things in a different light, whereas when we had treated them with harshness they had been found to be very dangerous." Ritualists did not need to read very closely between the lines in order to find encouragement here; and if this were not sufficient, they had still more in the Allocution which followed shortly after, and was calculated to undo even the little good which the Public Worship Act promised.

It is to the credit of the Primate's heart that he makes these attempts at conciliation, but they do not tell much to the honour of his judgment. But if anyone is too eager to condemn, he should first take fairly into account the hesitation a man may well feel when a decided policy may have the effect of destroying all the institutions over whose safety he, above all men, has to watch, and whose fall, by any error of his, would cover his name and memory with dishonour. To be the destroyer of an Establishment so venerable, is a fate which any Primate might well anxiously seek to avoid. Whether a shilly-shally policy may not in the long run prove to be the most dangerous, is a question not possible to discuss further here.

His evident indisposition to resort to extreme measures against the troublers of the peace, is certainly not due to their deferential bearing towards him, and has no effect on them in leading them to show even ordinary courtesy in their criticisms of their chief ruler. Whether it is that his mildness

encourages their insolence, or that they hope to overawe their adversaries by sheer bullying, their attacks upon the Primate have gone far beyond the license even of political warfare, at least in these times. In the days of Sacheverel and Swift, those distinguished ornaments of the English Church, a similar style of controversy was common. But a spite so malignant, that it has been ready to cast doubts on the validity of the Archbishop's baptism, in utter indifference to the serious consequences which would ensue if their point could be established, and so an important link in the Apostolical succession broken, and which does not hesitate to prepare weapons for the Liberation Society, by giving a list of the Archbishop's appointments, is not often met with now except in Church journals.

It is more pleasant to turn to another side of the Archbishop's conduct, and to note the liberality and wisdom with which he has sought recently to persuade, though all in vain, to make concessions in relation to the Burials Bill. His speech in Convocation was remarkably broad—for it did what so few Churchmen, and, above all, so few Prelates, are able to do—recognised even political Dissenters as Christian brethren, and urged the cultivation of fraternal Christian relations with them. Would that he always spoke in the same spirit! But, in truth, he is only too ready for a quiet sneer at Dissenters. Then, at the Lord Mayor's banquet, he took occasion to have a fling at them in a style which was neither chivalrous nor Christian. The

joke about the grocer is so stale and flat, that it was undignified in him to pick it up and throw it at honourable adversaries. Besides, after reading his own speeches in Convocation and Parliament, there are many Churchmen who will be of opinion that he has so much to correct at home that he may well leave others to take up this parable against Dissenters. The mythical grocers are not so perilous to the country as the real priests, whom he denounces and against whom he legislates, but whom he does so little to repress. He has great faith in the influence of bishops, and may feel that he is doing good service to the Church by distributing his patronage among men of his own circle, who, of course, are right in doctrine and submissive in spirit. But this mode of putting down Ritualism is too slow to be quite agreeable to the ardent Protestantism whose suspicions his Grace arouses, but whose demands he does so little to satisfy.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

WHY the tendencies to union and centralisation, which have been at work everywhere else, have not affected the territorial arrangements of the Established Church, why this realm of England is for ecclesiastical purposes divided into two provinces, and why Convocation should meet in two distinct bodies, acting to a considerable extent independently of each other, are mysteries which the uninitiated observer can hardly be expected to understand. It is easy to see what facilities for discussion, controversy, and even schism, this separation presents, and it is extremely hard to discover what possible good it accomplishes. It was suited to a time when travelling was costly and difficult, and when local jealousies were strong; but it is an anachronism now that London can be reached by the bishops or proctors of the most northern sees far more easily than even so late as half a century ago they could have reached York. Yet the cumbrous machinery which might have been suitable enough to the past

is kept up without any improvement to adapt it to the altered circumstances of the present, and whenever it is thought necessary to ask the consent of Convocation, an appeal must be made to the Chamber of the Northern as well as the Southern Province. What might happen if these two august bodies were to arrive at different conclusions, or if the two Archbishops were to be strong partisans and of opposite opinions, does not appear. Perhaps it is assumed that bishops, and especially archbishops, may be trusted never to trespass beyond the bounds of judicious moderation, whatever their individual opinions may be, and, at all events, the commotion which would arise out of any proposal to deprive the Church of an archbishop, or to merge the provincial assemblies in one national convocation, would be so great, that things will doubtless remain as they are at present, until the time of Disestablishment—that event to which so many Churchmen look forward with fear, indeed, and yet not without the hope that it may enable them to remove many anomalies, of which they are fully conscious, but with which the instinct of self-preservation forbids them to meddle.

But these are grave matters of State, with which the *profanum vulgus*, and especially Dissenters, ought not to intermeddle; and no doubt by strong Anglicans any criticisms or suggestions of theirs would only be regarded as signs of gross ignorance or moral perversity. If it was thought worth while to touch them at all, they might be

met with some display of learning, such as that with which a *Saturday Reviewer* will sometimes overwhelm the *Times*. Very probably any change could be shown to involve a contempt of some grand historic traditions, or to menace some ecclesiastical prerogatives, which could not be touched without danger to the Church. Well, there is at all events as much sanction in the New Testament for the province as for the diocese, for the archbishop as the bishop; and if episcopalians find only good in these gradations in their hierarchy, and think it important to have a "Primate of England" at York as well as a "Primate of all England" at Canterbury, it is not for us further to interfere with matters which are too high for us. Our business here is not with the office, but with its occupant, the "Most Rev. Dr. Thomson," to whom the present constitution of the Church gives the second place in the hierarchy. The Bishops of London and Winchester have positions of greater influence and more political importance, and even in his own province the Bishop of Durham, so long as he retained the ancient dignities and emoluments of his see, could compete with him in secular advantages, while his two suffragans of Manchester and Ripon have a larger amount of spiritual responsibility and work. But he is above them all in rank, and no one who has ever seen Dr. Thomson can suppose that he will ever sacrifice an iota of the consideration and authority which he is thus entitled to claim.

The Archbishop owes his elevation mainly to his own talent and industry, and may be quoted by defenders of the State-Church as an illustration of the popular character of an institution, whose highest honours may be won by force of mind and character without the aid of aristocratic connections. The distinguished career of Dr. Thomson no doubt reflects great credit on himself, and to a certain extent upon the Establishment; for though it would be worse than an exaggeration to say that its richest prizes are invariably the reward of merit, and that the humblest curate can feel that if he conscientiously does his work, and shows himself worthy of high promotion, he may feel confident that he carries, if not the mitre of a bishop, at least the hat of a dean, in his portmanteau, and though a man who starts with the advantage of high birth and influential friends in his favour may expect to reach the goal sooner than one who has nothing on which to rely except his power and his work, yet it is, on the whole, true that in the distribution of the higher patronage merit does count for a good deal, and that without it even a large amount of court favour will not avail to secure a man a prominent ecclesiastical position. Such an exception, however, does not disprove the rule. There is a good deal of merit that is allowed to live and die in obscurity; but a man must have interest of a very extraordinary power if he is able to win a mitre without any distinguishing merit. York itself supplies the proof that this remark is not

equally true in relation to deaneries. The late Lord Derby, it will be remembered, apologised for the appointment of the present Dean, who is confessedly not of conspicuous abilities, on the ground that as the office had only an income of £1,000 a year, it was necessary it should be filled by a man of private means. By a remarkable coincidence, the Ecclesiastical Commission found it desirable soon after to double the salary.

There are, of course, great diversities of opinion about individual appointments, and there are very few which escape the condemnation of some party; but with all the criticism they provoke there is seldom any allegation of a lack of ability on the part of those selected for high office. The days are gone by when it was safe to make a man a bishop, or even a dean, simply because he was the nephew of a Cabinet Minister, or had been able to do some service for a Royal personage, which spoke more for his suppleness and pliancy than for his capacity or his goodness, or even because he had done good political work for the party in power. The Ritualists are as dissatisfied with the Episcopal Bench as ever, and Mr. Orby Shipley gives what is evidently intended for a graphic sketch of what it is at present in describing what it would not be if the Bishops were not "State-created." "The successful schoolmaster, with slender pretensions to theological acquirements, or the schoolmaster not eminently successful, the reason of whose elevation remains a mystery; the mere textual scholar,

though acute New Testament critic; the popular, if sceptically-mated essayist, or the facile and brilliant, if superficial preacher at a proprietary chapel; the secular educationalist, unguarded in speech at public meetings even to indiscretion; or the university don, ignorant of all practical knowledge,—these, so far as they failed to add to their many social distinctions, secular learning, or gifts of nature—qualities which marked them as fitting to adorn episcopal rank—would not be placed in situations where want of confidence between rulers and ruled would be conspicuous."

This criticism is meant to be severe, but really proves nothing, except the difficulty, or rather impossibility, of satisfying the Ritualists, whose model bishop would be one who, like the late Bishop of Salisbury, would inculcate the highest form of "Catholic" doctrine, and sanction the most advanced style of "Catholic" ritual. Certain it is that under the "watchful jealousy" which is commonly regarded as the special attribute of Dissenters, but which is exercised at least as much by Anglicans and Evangelicals in relation to all appointments, to say nothing of the keen scrutiny of the press and of public opinion generally, Ministers are not likely to make unworthy appointments. Perhaps, too, looking at the present state of Church parties, and the bitter feelings they express towards each other, it may safely be said the State gives the Church better rulers than she would choose herself. Assuredly some of the ablest

men among the bishops, and those whose work is telling the most effectively in favour of the Establishment, would never have been placed there by clerical votes. The true interests of the Church might, indeed, have been better advanced by men of another order. But it would not be easy to find prelates more likely to preserve the influence of the Establishment—that Establishment whose continuance is said by its defenders to be essential to save the nation from utter infidelity, and in relation to which, of course, statesmen are chiefly anxious—than some of those whom the clergy would have refused to elect to the episcopate. High Church clergymen have no liking for either of the Archbishops or the Bishop of Manchester. They would have elected none of them, nor any other man who was not prepared to assert the authority of the Church. For other reasons they would hardly have been more acceptable to the Evangelicals. Yet it is these prelates, and others of the same type, who save the Establishment from the perils in which rulers like the Bishops of Lincoln, or Winchester, or Salisbury, would soon involve it.

It is not necessary to attempt to identify Dr. Thomson with any of Mr. Shipley's pen-and-ink sketches given above, all of which, it need hardly be said, are strongly coloured by the artist's own idiosyncrasies, though there is no reason why he need be greatly disturbed if he was pointed out as the original of one of them. It is, no doubt, true that

he was a "university don," but he could not have been that unless he was a man of power. That he was without experience of parochial administration was probably a misfortune and deficiency; but even that was better surely than a career which had revealed the arrogant priest, and shown him ready to disturb the peace of a parish, to insult and outrage the conscientious feelings of the great body of his parishioners, and so to imperil the influence of the Church herself by his eccentricities. He might have done all this in his "Catholic" zeal, and Mr. Shipley would nevertheless have hailed him as an exemplary bishop; but he contemptuously dismisses a man who does not belong to his school, no matter what his ability and learning and piety, as a mere "university don." For some reason or other, these said dons are thought by many to be fair subjects of attack. Perhaps there is some envy of the success which they have achieved; perhaps there is an idea that the *otium cum dignitate* they enjoy is not very creditable to men who are still capable of doing work in the world; perhaps there is a secret notion on the part of the rising generation that there is a good deal of old fogeyism about them, and in relation to some of them this is quite true. But the man who has become the head of his college, in virtue of the impression which his qualifications have made upon his friends and rivals, is certainly not a man to be despised, and one who reaches such a position as the reward of pure scholarship and ability at an

early age, like Dr. Thomson, must be a man of undoubted power.

Dr. Thomson's election as Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, was the more honourable to him because it was obtained despite the prominent part he had taken in some collegiate reforms in opposition to the conservative instincts of the authorities. Nor ought we to deny our admiration to the unknown boy from Cumberland, who became successively Scholar, Provost, and Fellow of his college, and thus prepared the way for the higher distinctions he subsequently obtained, first as Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and subsequently as Archbishop of York. If, however, anyone is prepared to assert that Churchmen and Dissenters are on a position of equality in this country, let him look at such a career as the Archbishop's. What he has achieved was, no doubt, possible to any youth of equal ability and industry at any of our grammar-schools, but it must be on one condition, that he accept the Thirty-nine Articles and be a member of the Church of England. It is a glorious feature in our country, to which we may point with some degree of pride, that there are no caste distinctions which deprive distinguished talent of the meed of honour and emolument to which it is fairly entitled; but it is equally to her discredit that there are barriers interposed in the name of religion, to the success of all who will not subscribe the Creed and conform to the Church of the State. There may have been other lads among the strong-headed people of the

North, contemporaries with Dr. Thomson, and fully able to compete with him for the prizes which he won; but if they were Presbyterians or Independents, the opportunity was denied them. So far as the universities are concerned, the grievance is partly though not wholly redressed, but in the National Church it still remains. No doubt if a Church has high distinctions and ample revenues, there must be special advantages belonging to its members; but as the Anglican Church professes to be a national institution, and is in the enjoyment of immense national funds, it has no right to maintain sectarian barriers which exclude large classes from participation in its privileges because of their religious opinions. As it is, whatever the merit of a man like Dr. Thomson, the high rewards with which it was crowned were a premium for religious and ecclesiastical orthodoxy as well as for intellectual power and scholastic success, and they served to make the injustice which Dissenters suffer the more conspicuous.

The learning of the young scholar might have been as extensive as it was proved to be, but if he had not been able to sign the Thirty-nine Articles and the Three Creeds, and to accept the authority of bishops as supreme in the Church, he could not at that time have obtained a fellowship, and even now the headship of his college would be closed against him. Is it wonderful if others, as true Englishmen as Dr. Thomson, should complain that they have not the same chances open to them in a

great national institution because of their theological opinions? Why should a man's proficiency in classical verse, or his mastery of mathematical problems, count for more because he has no scruple about subscription to prescribed formularies? A career like Dr. Thomson's shows what is possible to a talented young Churchman, but impossible to a young Dissenter with equal powers. It is an example of the inequality of which Nonconformists complain.

It is not easy to define exactly the school in the Church to which the Archbishop belongs. His theological views are decidedly Evangelical, and he is generally looked up to with respect by the Evangelicals, both because of his doctrinal opinions and his dislike to Ritualism. Nevertheless, he cannot be classed as of their party. He is not, indeed, like some of his colleagues, anxious to preserve an absolute impartiality, for he is not afraid to express distinct opinions, and to take a course so decided as to expose himself to the charge of being a partisan. But there is in him too much of the High Church sentiment, so far as the maintenance of Church authority and especially of the prerogatives of his own office, is concerned, to allow of his being a hearty Evangelical. Rationalists and Broad Churchmen of course will say that he is not of them, and would probably describe him as illiberal and unfair in his action towards them. Into the truth of such allegations it is not necessary to enter here, but it is pretty certain that his Lordship would not

desire to claim a relationship to their school. Perhaps he would say that he is of no party, but simply a Churchman. He sympathises with the Evangelicals in their Protestantism, but there are other points on which he has no affinity. But though he may esteem them narrow, he is not in any true sense of the term a Liberal Churchman.

It seems hardly more difficult for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven than for a bishop to be really broad and liberal. In neither case is the thing impossible, and so there are a few prelates who resist all the temptations to narrowness, dogmatism, and exclusiveness which the office itself presents; but the Northern Primate is not of the number. Indeed, his natural temperament and his special studies lead him in the opposite direction. There is a good deal of the hard, granite-like strength about men trained in the cold, rugged regions of the North. They take too firm a grip of every principle they accept to be able to appreciate the position of those who reject it. What they see they see clearly, but they do not take large and comprehensive views. They have a firmness and self-reliance greatly to be admired, but these qualities are often associated with a severe dogmatism. To a mind of this type logic is a congenial pursuit, but it is just that which confirms and increases its original defects, and makes it more intolerant of a dissent which appears to it inconsistent with sound reasoning, and which no

doubt is so if the fundamental principles of its censor are to be assumed.

Dr. Thomson is a clear, acute, and vigorous logician. He became first known to the world by an excellent little manual on the "Laws of Thought," whose merit is appreciated in America as well as in this country, though we are bound to say that for some of its most distinctive features it is indebted to Sir William Hamilton. His theological writings are the natural product of a mind which has been trained by such studies. They are clear, decided, and, if the first principles be granted, conclusive. But, unhappily, there are too many who will not grant Dr. Thomson's premises, and on their acute reasoning, with its sharp lines of definition, its rigid processes, its quiet but assured advance from point to point until the conclusion is reached, all goes for nothing. Thus his own essay in the "Aids to Faith" is addressed solely to those who admit some value in the sufferings of Christ, and intended to show them that on their own principles they are bound to admit the doctrine of the Atonement. It has, no doubt, a certain value for this particular class, but in reading it the conviction is forced on the mind that for meeting the difficulties or removing the doubts of any who have been seriously affected by the sceptical thinking of the day, it would be useless. A more sympathetic style of argument, a greater care to understand the character of the objections, a little more of the feeling of a man who knows that he himself

is compassed about with infirmities and tendencies to err, or even though it was purchased by the sacrifice of a little logical exactness, would be more likely to produce a beneficial effect. But the Archbishop lacks both originality and sympathy. He is a hard worker, but he is nothing more. At the same time it is willingly admitted that there is an advantage even in the apparent hardness of his treatment of current scepticism. Our modern unbelief has become, in many cases, so self-sufficient in its spirit, so dogmatic in its tone, and so arrogant in its bearing towards the old faith, that it is well there should be some to challenge its pretensions and expose their hollowness. The Romish Church is hardly more confident in the assertion of her infallibility, and certainly is not more defiant in her tone towards opponents, than are some of the sceptics of the day. They set themselves forth both as interpreters of Nature and expositors of the Word of God; they propound the most startling theories of the one, and exhibit the other in new and unexpected lights which have never been perceived by those who have been studying the record for centuries; they give us new readings and strange interpretations, and altogether so represent the teachings both of Nature and of Scripture, that they wear an altogether strange and unfamiliar aspect. Yet they expect us at once to receive them on their word, and do not fail to make those who will not bow to their authority understand that their dissent is a sign either of crass ignorance or invincible prejudice.

No thoughtful man, for example, can study the Theory of Evolution without perceiving that there are enormous gaps in the so-called proof which have to be filled up by very large assumptions, often without the slightest warrant either from fact or analogy. Yet there are a number of our physicists who can hardly repress the pitying scorn with which they regard a man who does not believe in the leading principles of the Darwinian Gospel. With such thinkers the Archbishop deals more effectually than one who would have shown them more consideration. To a logical mind like his, their mode of argumentation must be an offence, and he finds a pleasure in demolishing its great pretensions. His analysis of the materialistic philosophy in his lecture for the Christian Evidence Society was evidently done *con amore;* and though it is not likely that it will reclaim any who have accepted these sceptical views, it ought at all events to have the effect of saving some who were being drawn under their influence, and especially such as are attracted by the idea that all the intellect of the age is in opposition to the Gospel.

At a time, too, when so many of the bishops —rulers of the Church though they profess to be— seem to consider that the neutral tint is the only one tolerable on the Episcopal Bench, and that the highest proof of wisdom that they can give is to refrain from definite expression of opinion on any disputed point, a clear-headed, strong-minded, and logical Archbishop is not without his uses. His

brother of Canterbury will do all that is necessary in the way of accommodation, and it is surely not amiss that one of Dr. Tait's pliant nature should be strengthened by the presence of a more stern and decided colleague at York. At present it seems to be thought that the great aim of Church policy should be to comprehend everybody that will be comprehended; and, therefore, to avoid saying or doing anything that is likely to offend and divide. "We must keep together, or the Dissenters will come and destroy our place and our Church," is the cry of a thousand Church defenders, clerical and lay alike, from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Marquis of Salisbury downward. Possibly the policy may have the same result as that of him who advised his fellows to sacrifice truth and justice, and even to shed innocent blood, to stave off the evil which he supposed to be coming. The price may be paid and the danger not escaped, the strength of the Church's testimony on behalf of the truth compromised, and yet Disestablishment not averted. To strong men on all sides the policy seems infatuation, and its utter collapse a certainty. A more decided course, such as the Archbishop of York would adopt, might precipitate a crisis; but even if it did, and if the issue were disastrous to the Establishment, it would at least fall with more dignity than it will do if it expires of sheer inanition, or of a strong access of Romish fever, induced by the very feebleness resulting from the miserable system of see-saw which at present finds favour with so many of her rulers.

That he is not a favourite with the Ritualists is not surprising. They recognise in him a foe, and one who is strong and decided, who has to a larger extent than is common among bishops the courage of his convictions, and the power with which to sustain them. He has not taken such decided measures to repress Ritualism as his neighbour of Durham has done, neither has he shown the same uncompromising temper. He has at times, indeed, seemed anxious to exhibit what is generally supposed to be the judicial temper becoming one in such a high position, and invested with such responsibilities. Thus, in dealing with the excitement relative to the spread of the confessional, he tried to allay any anxiety which might be felt by recalling the history of a similar agitation produced by some previous developments of the Ritualistic school, which threatened to produce serious results, but which soon died out. The allusion was unfortunate, unless the Archbishop's first concern was that the Establishment should survive and have peace in his days. If he had any strong desire for the preservation of Protestantism, the reminiscence ought to have had anything but a reassuring effect, either on his own mind or that of others, for if the excitement had abated, it was not because the evil had been removed, but rather because a despair of dealing effectually with it had sprung up. The advanced point reached by the encroaching Romanisers was itself calculated to awaken only alarm all the more intense, because of the failure of previous efforts to check their pro-

gress. The Archbishop was, in truth, like a general who should seek to quiet his garrison, alarmed by an attack made upon their Malakhoff, with the assurance that they had been equally disturbed when their Redan was menaced and taken. What effect such assurance would be likely to exert upon those who saw a fort which previously had served the purposes of their defence embraced within the lines of the enemy and turned into an engine of attack, it is easy to imagine. The soothing words of his Grace must have exerted a very similar influence upon the earnest Protestants of the country.

The secrets of episcopal conclaves are not disclosed to the outside world, but it is hardly assuming too much to give the Archbishop credit for some considerable share in the composition of the Allocution of last year, which was certainly one of the most remarkable specimens of the art of "how not to do it" which even a Bench of Bishops has ever produced; and although it would be unwise to assign any limits to human capacities in that respect, it is not easy to suppose that any future manifestoes of the kind will surpass it. As councils of war never fight, a Bench of Bishops is not likely to say or do anything very decided and forcible. In truth, a document which was to have the signatures of the Bishop of Ely and his brother of Ripon, of the Protestant Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol and the "Catholic" ruler of Lincoln, of the quondam heretic at Exeter and the eminent champion of the faith at Bath and Wells, must assuredly have a very

neutral character. Of course it was possible, and it may have seemed very ingenious, to prepare a manifesto of the kind. There is never an insuperable difficulty in devising generalities and ambiguities on which men who, though they differ, think it expedient to keep their differences to themselves, may be able to agree. The marvel is that any sensible men could ever have come to the belief that such a document would reflect any credit on themselves or do good to anybody else. But when we take further into account the bitterness of the contending parties whom it was thought possible to harmonise by a judicious administration of this precious soothing powder, the marvel grows. Indeed, one is tempted to ask whether the bishops can have so far crushed out all earnest convictions in their own hearts that they are unable to see how they affect others who have not reached the same lofty heights of philosophic calm. Dr. Thomson has no more right, so far as any information the public enjoys can affect him, to be credited with responsibility for the Allocution than any other prelate, but an Archbishop, and especially one with a mind so clear and a will so decided as his, must be something more than a mere unit in a council chamber.

His conduct at the Northern Convocation last spring would indicate that he has been aroused to some perception of the dangers of the situation. It was, at all events, very satisfactory to find him, in his own vigorous and incisive style, making such

short work of the compromises suggested, and the pleas by which they were sustained. Expressing a desire that the Church should be made "truly national" and acknowledging that this can only be effected by its being placed on a broad basis, he set forth a view of the case which so many of the Church defenders are anxious to ignore or deny. "It has been the policy of the country ever since the Reformation—and I have nothing to say against the Reformation, on the contrary, I hold it to have been the greatest blessing to religion that it took place—ever since the Reformation the policy of this country has always been, I say, to have Acts of Uniformity; and when we are told by the Dean of Manchester that he wants freedom in the sense of getting rid of uniformity, I am bound to say that if we accept his view we shall not be attempting to mend the Rubrics, but we shall be attempting to alter the whole principles of our legislation from the very first. Besides, the question is, who is to have the discretion? If you allow an unlimited discretion to the clergy, and if the discretion of the laity should take a different direction, a collision must be looked for." History and law both sustain His Grace's view, but it is impossible to reconcile it with the theory of the Establishment proposed by the Dean of Westminster, and employed by Liberal Churchmen in their arguments against Nonconformists. When the Act of Uniformity is repealed it will be time to talk about comprehension, which may then become a reality. But in the meantime the

Archbishop has only exhibited the real bearing of the law, and it is as absurd for one party to claim liberty for themselves as it is for another to call upon the country to admire and support the marvellous provision for the union of "almost every school of thought" in an institution whose policy, ever since it took its present character, has been embodied in Acts of Uniformity. "To maintain uniformity," said the Archbishop, "is the principle upon which we are bound to proceed," and unless he be wholly mistaken as to the intent and force of the law which he has to enforce as a judge as well as to administer as a prelate, the comprehension, of which so much is said, and on which so many ingenious pleas for the Establishment are based, is altogether opposed to the fundamental ideas of the institution.

The Archbishop deserves credit, not only for thus frankly recognising facts instead of playing with fancies, but still more for plainly letting High Churchmen know that on them the responsibility for the present difficult and perilous position of the Establishment rests, and for warning them that the "tension cannot long continue." Nothing, certainly, but a strong sense of danger could have led him to employ the plain language which he used in Convocation. He is a man of courtly manners, not likely, in mere wantonness, to endanger his own influence and popularity, and fully sensible of the power which the party to whom he addressed his censures and appeals exercises in that society to whose rewards he is supposed not to be indifferent.

Yet he does not hesitate to tell High Churchmen that they are chiefly to blame for the severity of the crisis which has arisen, and that if the dangers are to be escaped, it is by them that the deliverance of the Establishment, menaced by their tenderness for extreme men, is to be accomplished. "I believe that if the High Church would only definitely state that they have no sympathy with such things, and would assist in legislation only so far as not to encourage these extreme views and practices, that the Church of England might be regarded, under God, as safe." It would be idle to discuss whether the result of such action on the part of the High Church would be as satisfactory as the Archbishop anticipates, for it is pretty certain his advice will not be taken. It proceeds on the common assumption of Church optimists that all who are not prepared for extreme courses themselves are desirous to put down those who are. Moderate High Churchmen, however, may very reasonably feel that the laws directed against Ritualists would tell against principles which are equally dear to themselves, and they must be utterly wanting in chivalry if they purchase exemption for their own peccadilloes by joining in the hue and cry against those who hold the same principles, though they may have pushed them to a greater extent.

The Archbishop has a sufficiently high conception of his episcopal authority, and would not suffer it lightly to be set aside. Those who have watched him closely have marked a perceptible change in

his tone and deportment since his accession to his present high dignity. I remember hearing him preach some years ago, when his honours were fresh upon him, and at the time was much struck with the simplicity of his manner and the unpretending air which marked his whole bearing. Even Dissenting ministers sometimes conduct themselves in a style which contrasted strongly with the quiet naturalness of the English dignitary on that occasion. He carried himself as an earnest Christian man, not without a proper consciousness of his power, but without a trace of priestly assumption. The service was of the lowest type of the Low Church, and he entered heartily into it, uniting in the service of praise with the congregation as one of themselves, and creating a prepossession in his favour by the evident fervour of his manner. His sermon was Evangelical both in doctrine and spirit, clear in its argument, and forcible in its appeals; altogether, a very fine example of the best class of Church preaching. If it did not rise to the level of the silvery eloquence of the Bishop of Winchester, or the tempestuous rhetoric of his brother of Peterborough, or the marvellous force and stirring oratory of Canon Liddon, and if there was not in it much of that sympathetic element which lends such power to discourses which may be intellectually inferior, like those of Dr. Vaughan, there was a manly tone, a logical strength, and at the same time a felicitous style, which made it extremely telling and effective; and it was all the more so because there was nothing

in the matter or delivery to remind us that we were listening to an archbishop.

I have not heard him since that time; but if I am to judge from his published addresses, I should doubt whether the Bench has improved him. Are there any men whom it does really improve? All their surroundings are against it. The position which they occupy in relation to their brethren, the amount of deference, often degenerating into servility and flattery, which they receive, the elevation of their social status above that of all other ministers, naturally tend to produce a considerable amount of self-consciousness and hauteur, and it requires no little grace to resist such dangerous influences. Of late years, indeed, the different Church parties seem to have felt themselves bound to supply a necessary counteractive to such injurious tendencies, and some of their journals have set themselves to play the part of Saladin's slave, and remind the bishops that they are but men, and very erring and imperfect men too. It must have been modesty which prevented the Bishop of Manchester, when he was enumerating in his charge the offences of Nonconformists against the law of Christian courtesy in their attacks upon the Church, from referring to the far more serious transgressions of the Ritualist clergy in their criticisms of the bishops. Of late, too, the Evangelicals have been imitating this bad example, and have gone a long way towards surpassing it. Indeed, on all sides there seems to be great respect for the office,

mingled with a strong disposition to attack the men who hold it; while, on the other hand, the bishops are apt to consider that a good deal belongs to the man, and conduct themselves accordingly. At least, the determination to magnify their office seems naturally to develop in most of them considerable self-exaltation; and the Archbishop of York, who is in a sense (though it is not easy for an outsider to define exactly to what extent) a bishop of bishops, is certainly no exception to the rule. He has a sufficient idea of his rights, and he will maintain them. What reason his clergy can have to complain of this is not apparent. It is absurd for them to expect that they can have the dignity conferred by the presence of a bishop or archbishop among them, and yet not be under his authority.

We of the world outside have more reason to complain of the Archbishop's tone when he undertakes to deal with us. His speech at the meeting of the National School Society was a fair example of his style of addressing opponents; and while it certainly did not conciliate, still less would it do anything towards producing conviction. It stands out in remarkable contrast with that of the Bishop of Manchester, who is just as decided in his views, but who has the idea, evidently so hard for the episcopal, and, above all, for the archiepiscopal, mind to entertain, that his opponents may be as conscientious, and even as nearly right, as himself. Such a thought evidently does not disturb the self-

complacency of the Archbishop of York. Is he not a primate in the Church, and has he not a right to speak with authority? He would not grieve the conscience of any "serious Nonconformists," under which designation, of course, the political Dissenter is not included; but he does not hesitate to say that an action to which a great majority of Dissenters are committed is intended to set up a "brazen altar to a God unmentionable." He knows, or ought to know, that there are hundreds and thousands of men who are as zealous for the Gospel as he is, and who would deprecate as earnestly as he could the idea of excluding religion from education, but who believe that the surest way to reduce religious teaching to a mere form is to make it the work of a State functionary; and yet he talks as though all opposed to his view were unbelievers. They do not walk in his light, and so they can be nothing better than "owls and bats from the modern town of Birmingham." It is this mode of speaking which prevents the Archbishop from doing the service which, alike from his ability and position, he ought to render to the cause of truth. If there was not so much to give the impression that he regards dissent from his views as a rebellion against the eternal order of the universe, he would be more likely to win the assent of other minds.

THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

IT is happily not necessary here to vindicate the right of deans to exist at all, for the task would not be a very light one. What place could possibly have been found for them in a society so simple in its character and arrangements as the Church of the New Testament, it is not very easy to see. But in the elaborate hierarchy of the Anglican Church they seem to be almost a necessity, a grade between the "right reverend" prelate and the "reverend" priest. At all events, there they are, and very useful some of them prove themselves to be, rendering, by means of the distinction and comparative leisure they enjoy, a kind of service to the Establishment which could hardly be so effectively done if their dignity were lower or their duties heavier. Not that some of them are not among the most hard-working men in the Establishment, but their work is for the most part made by themselves, and on that very account is all the more valuable. The Bishop of Carlisle, indeed, has an idea, derived from his own experience at Ely, that

a dean has very serious and responsible duties, which must occupy a great deal of his time. It may, therefore, possibly be ignorance only which has engendered the belief that decanal duties are light; but such at all events is the prevailing impression, and certainly the works with which the names of the more distinguished deans are connected have been voluntarily undertaken.

It is at least certain that a dean who, in these days, should adopt the notion that he had been called to a position of dignified ease, and act accordingly, would not have a very comfortable position. The Church journals would assail him with their characteristic fierceness, the secular press would find a pleasure in pointing out his defects, the sad condition of his cathedral would be the frequent theme of clerical lamentation, and he would soon learn that the age in which his lot has been cast is little disposed to tolerate the *otium cum dignitate* for which he had long sighed and into which he vainly fancied he had at length entered. In fact, if there is not work he must make it; he must have popular services in the nave of his cathedral, he must interest himself in the restoration of the Minster or Chapter-house, in some way he must make it felt that his office is a reality. Despite all this it must be said that a deanery is one of the most enviable positions the Establishment can offer, especially to a man of refined taste and literary habits. A dean is not exposed to the badgering which all bishops are

called on to endure. He has not the responsibility of curbing the excesses of the Ritualist, rebuking the rubrical transgressions of the Evangelical, or searching out the heresies of the Latitudinarian. It does not rest on him to institute costly prosecutions against clerical offenders, with the certainty that whatever course he may pursue he will be equally exposed to reproach. On the other hand, in his own cathedral he reigns supreme—to such an extent, indeed, that I knew of a Bishop whom the Dean for years prevented from preaching in the cathedral of his diocese. In such a position, he has the fullest opportunity for embodying his own æsthetic ideas, with the certainty of criticism indeed, but still with the knowledge that real improvements are sure to find considerable appreciation. He has, too, when he has discharged every function of his office, time at his disposal in which he can most efficiently serve the Church by labours in the field of theology and literature.

But there are deaneries and deaneries, and that of Westminster is not only the most desirable of the whole, not excepting even Canterbury itself, but it has, for various reasons, a position absolutely unique. Whether there are immunities and privileges attached to it which do not belong to others, or whether the liberty which Dean Stanley claims and exercises, without let or hindrance, is open to any dean who chooses to assert his own absolute will in his own cathedral in the same way, is a point which need not be determined here. The one thing

clear is, that in Westminster Abbey there is at present, under its most popular of deans, a comprehensiveness found nowhere else. Dr. Stanley, indeed, is not only the most influential of the deans, but he is, in many respects, the most influential man in the Establishment at present. This is owing to the combination of various qualities, which at first sight might appear incompatible. He is a man of considerable learning and scholarly habits, and yet he is, in the best sense, a man of the world. He is fond of research, but he is equally fond of active life. He can paint an exquisite picture, the subject of which he has exhumed from obscure records of the past, with almost unrivalled art, but he can also write an essay or make a stirring speech on some topic of the day, which shall charm even those who are most unable to accept his views by its freshness of thought and beauty of style. If he had been a mere recluse, he might have done more to build up a permanent literary reputation, but he would not have been the prominent man he is in his own generation. His multifarious duties, discharged as they are with remarkable zeal and energy, the keen interest he takes in the fortunes both of Church and State, the eagerness with which he continually throws himself into the fray on all questions which come within his very wide range of sympathy, almost necessarily prevent him from undertaking a great continuous work; but they have not hindered him from doing great literary service, and they

have contributed largely to the increase of his general influence.

But the Dean of Westminster has a conspicuous place in society as well as in the Church, and in this sphere Dr. Stanley shines almost as much as in the more public one. He has that perfect finish of manners which shows not only culture and experience, but a spirit thoroughly under control. It is impossible to come in contact with him without being struck with his urbanity of manner, his geniality of spirit, his perfect self-possession, and his Christian gentleness and amiability. He has unfailing resources for conversation, but even his intellectual are hardly so remarkable as his moral and spiritual qualities. A tendency to assumption, which is so often found in ministers of religion, must be regarded as a clerical fault. The influence of an Establishment is to develop it, especially in men whose only claim to distinction is official. It may be seen sometimes in the parish minister of Scotland, who, though his congregation have gone to the Free Church, still stands on his dignity and rights as the one authorised teacher of the people. It is, unfortunately, to be seen also in high dignitaries, whose intellectual power ought to have preserved them from it. In Dean Stanley it is conspicuous by its absence. This itself creates a prepossession in his favour, and the impression thus produced is confirmed by further experience. I saw him exposed on one occasion to a running fire of questions and re-

marks from a number of Nonconformists, who, having been invited to meet him, seemed desirous of improving the rare opportunity by giving him light as to their theological and ecclesiastical views. As the object of the gathering was the free interchange of thought, there was no objection to the line the conversation took, though at times the remarks made were so decided that a man of different temper might have been nettled. But the Dean was not in the slightest degree ruffled, and, in answer to a suggestion that some of the remarks were rather strong, himself urged perfect freedom. The manner in which he bore himself throughout, the courtesy with which he listened to every observation, and the anxiety he showed to give it its full weight, the manliness with which he maintained his own position, and the candour with which he recognised the force of any sound objection, were worthy of the highest praise. It is not probable that he effected any change of opinion in the minds of his questioners, but it is certain that he left them all charmed with the Christian grace of the man, and disposed to judge even his Church in a very different spirit from that which would have been awakened had they met with one whose whole gait, manner, and tone reminded them that he was a clergyman of the Established Church, and that it was with fear and trembling, and not without considerable misgiving as to the wisdom of his conduct, that he condescended so far as to converse with those

whose ministerial position the law does not recognise.

This personal bearing of the Dean, so uniformly courteous and considerate to others, accounts no doubt to some extent for the popularity he enjoys. It is felt by all who come in contact with him. A London Nonconformist minister wrote asking permission to conduct a class of young men through the Abbey. The Dean, not content with a friendly reply, himself became the guide, and afterwards the host, of the party. Is it necessary to add that all went away fascinated by their entertainer, who on this, as on every other occasion, was the soul of kindness and courtesy.

There are other and more substantial grounds on which it rests, likewise, but it is hardly possible to commend too highly the character of the man. It is not only that he is amiable, for many men are that, but in him there is a rare combination of strength and beauty. A man whose thoughts are always thoughts of peace, who regards the region of controversy as a low-lying valley ever wrapped in cloud and mist, which an earnest spiritual Christian will desire to avoid, who is afraid to say a strong thing even on behalf of the truth, lest some champion of error might perchance be offended, does not find it very hard work to be gentle. The misfortune is, that he is utterly without force, and while the world may say kind things about his amiability, it is never moved by his words or deeds. But the Dean is the furthest possible remove from

a character of this kind. He has the boldness of a lion in the vindication of his opinions, even though he is gentle as a lamb in his conduct to the champions of error. It is not easy, it seems almost impossible, to ruffle his temper, or to narrow the flow of that expansive charity which marks all his judgments of men and their opinions; indeed, the tenderness he shows to great evils or errors at times becomes almost provoking. Yet he never hesitates in the utterance of his own strong convictions, nor shrinks from the most compromising proceedings if he esteems them right, and feels that they may fairly be required of him. Archdeacon Dénison cannot be more outspoken and decided when circumstances demand the exercise of these qualities, and yet even in displaying them there is a sweetness which even a bishop intent on making everything pleasant all round could not surpass.

The Dean is one of the men, unfortunately too rare, and most rare among ministers of all Churches, who are not afraid to stand alone. Such isolation is not pleasant. It subjects a man to criticisms which are not agreeable, and sometimes to calumnies which are less agreeable still. It excites the suspicion that he is angular, and possibly it is true that none but angular men would choose to be isolated. Now the Dean is anything but angular. He would not purchase union by the sacrifice of independence or the concealment of principle, but he evidently yearns for Christian unity, and has a large measure of that charity which

"believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, which suffereth long and is kind." He has no love of controversy for its own sake, and yet he is continually found in antagonism to those with whom he would doubtless desire to act, and so exposes himself to a misrepresentation which to one of his spirit must be extremely painful. That he acts simply out of loyalty to truth, can be questioned by no impartial observer who has carefully watched his course. Nothing but his independence and honesty have stood in the way of his promotion. If he had been content to be silent in relation to certain points on which he has spoken and acted strongly, to hold his peace when he could not join in a popular cry, to let a good many things pass by and to abstain from action which he has taken in relation to others, he might have been the Primate of England to-day. His abilities certainly qualified him for the position, and he would have adorned it, and in it have rendered great service to the Church. But he has never been able to bow his knee to popular idols; he has protested where others would at all events have been silent; instead of diplomatic reserve he has often (as some would judge unwisely and needlessly) pronounced, and he has seen other men, of less power, rise to positions which might otherwise have been his. It was a strange thing that men with views so opposite as he and the late Dr. Wilberforce should be found in the same Church, but, despite grave objections to the

theology of Dr. Stanley, which are strongly felt even by many of his admirers, and which would be a difficulty in the way of his promotion, it is not to the credit of the Church that while the one is likely to remain in the deanery to the end of his days, the other presided over the important See of Winchester, and had very nearly attained the highest prize of ecclesiastical ambition.

This is surely a very suggestive comment on the Dean's own theory of the Establishment. It may be questioned whether a Liberal Minister could be found to make him a dean if he were not one already. It is pretty sure no one will be strong enough to make a bishop of the man, who, if he correctly interprets the idea of the Establishment, ought to be its Primate.

But Dean Stanley has never been careful whom he offended, so long as he followed the dictates of his own conscience, and, as he must have expected and calculated, he has had a certain penalty to pay. Sometimes he has displeased political friends; more frequently he has crossed the prejudices and roused the opposition of his ecclesiastical brethren. It must have been extremely trying for him to differ from the Liberal party, to which he has always been attached, in relation to the disestablishment of the Irish Church; and his position certainly was not made more pleasant by the temper of those with whom he found himself associated. But it seemed to him necessary and right that he should oppose what he

considered a violation of sound principle, and he did it without getting much credit from those whom he so chivalrously supported. The Liberal associates whom he had deserted for the nonce treated him more generously, however, than his clerical brethren have done, when he has placed himself in antagonism to them, as his loyalty to conscience has often forced him to do. With the exception, indeed, of the maintenance of a State Church (and of that he has a theory which few, if any of them, would accept), there is hardly a point in which he agrees with them. He is a frequent and powerful speaker in Convocation, but he is almost invariably in opposition, and opposition which is numerically very weak, and the feeling which his speeches often awake in some of the more advanced clerics is one only of blank horror.

It would be a curiosity to hear Archdeacon Denison's private opinion of the Dean. The former reciprocates the courtesy, and something more than courtesy, which he receives at the hands of his opponent (for the Archdeacon has many noble qualities); but it may be doubted whether even the respect that he must cherish for his opponent's ability and character enables him to overcome the indignation which some of his speeches must excite. On one occasion, indeed, the Archdeacon was so excited that he left the Chamber, declaring that he could not any longer listen to the fearful statements which the Dean was making. It was in a debate on the Athanasian

Creed that this remarkable scene occurred. In a speech of marvellous clearness and force, the Dean was assailing the venerable document so dear to the hearts of all sound High Churchmen. He not only questioned its age and impugned its authority, but he went on to maintain that not a bishop on the Bench fully believed it, and that those in the Lower House who were most zealous in its defence knew that some of its statements were false. This was too much for the Archdeacon. He had borne much, but this exceeded even his powers of endurance. He would not wait either for explanation or qualification, but did his best to clear himself from the guilt of such blasphemy by at once turning his back on the orator who could utter, and the assembly which could tolerate, such impious suggestions.

The Dean's speech on that occasion, able, and in some respects convincing, as it was—unanswerable if it had been addressed to a body which was free to deal with the Creed, and did not stand pledged by the most solemn declarations to hold it, and imperatively bound to use it in the most sacred services of their Church — leaves an extremely painful impression on the mind. Speaking of the damnatory clauses, he said: "They belong to that state of belief which maintained that error on these theological subjects was the greatest of crimes. They belong to that wretched system which regarded heresy as a crime, which the Church and the State, and all the powers of the earth,

were bound to extirpate in the same way as murder, or theft, or any of the other great moral and social evils that pollute mankind. That this opinion, which is thus incorporated in the damnatory clauses, is absolutely false—('Oh, oh!' and interruption)—and I will venture to say, not only is it absolutely false, but it is believed by every single member of this House to be absolutely false, ('No, no'),'' &c. No doubt it needed considerable courage to speak thus, but surely there is here also a remarkable illustration of the perverting influence which the State Church exercises upon the mind, that a man of the high and honourable character of the Dean should make the avowal that a Creed to which he has given his assent, and which must at certain times be used in the services of his cathedral as a deliberate utterance of the faith of the clergy and the congregation, contains statements of principle which are utterly false, and believed to be so by those who use them. The interruptions were only what might have been expected, and there was force in the pointed remonstrance of Sir George Prevost, who said: "I think the Dean ought to consider how much he is wounding the feelings of the clergy of this country, as well as members of this House, by imputing to them deliberate falsehood." But he might have inquired if the Dean had considered the light in which he was presenting his own conduct. To his own Master he stands or falls, and it would be presumption, or something worse, for anyone to

undertake to sit in judgment upon him; but he can hardly estimate the effect which words like these produce upon numbers of unsophisticated minds, which are accustomed to think that if a man cannot adhere to the engagements he has made, he ought, at all events, to surrender any advantages which he may be enjoying in consideration of their fulfilment. He has adopted a theory of the State Church, and of the nature of the obligations which her clergy have contracted, which no doubt justifies his action to his own mind, but the difficulty which others have is, to see how it is possible for a man to suppose that he can be warranted in thus ignoring the actual facts and conforming his practice to a mere theory of his own. The Dean is so far to be honoured that he does not attempt a doubtful kind of explanation, but frankly avows his disbelief in the formulary which he has nevertheless accepted, and is bound to use; but not the less is it hard to understand how he can reconcile that disbelief with the retention of his ecclesiastical position.

The relation which the Athanasian Creed sustains to the Establishment, and the responsibility it entails not only on those who recite but those who respond to it, or give it the sanction of their adherence to the Church of which it is an authoritative formulary, are points which puzzle outsiders. Mr. Matthew Arnold, the latest defender, describes it as "a great national society for the promotion of goodness, and that by means of the Christian religion and the

Bible." But unless facts are voted out of court as irrelevant to the discussion, or words mean the opposite of what they say, the Christian religion, according to the Prayer-Book, is summarised in the Athanasian Creed. What Mr. Arnold thinks of that may be gathered from his blasphemous fable of the "Three Shaftesburys." Yet he is a champion of the Establishment, and meekly attempts to give "a new and better construction" of the Bible, to save us from the predominance of theological systems; that is, in plain language, to overthrow the Catholic faith, which the Church he defends requires all its members to keep whole and entire under pain of eternal damnation. What can plain people think of all this strange jugglery with words, or what influence must it exert on the moral feelings of the community?

The "Westminster scandal," as the Ritualists are so fond of calling it—that is, the invitation the Dean gave to all the members of the Committees for revising the translation of the Scriptures, regardless of their varieties in creed, to unite in the celebration of the Lord's Supper—is another example of his fearless independence. But here, though he was warring against the prejudices of his brethren, he had the law on his side, and, so far as I can see, the theory of the National Church. The State binds the clergy by a definite subscription; but it leaves the laity perfectly free, and no clergyman has a right to set up a test which the law has not

instituted. The attendant at a Congregational, Baptist, Wesleyan, or even Unitarian Chapel, has just as much right to the privileges of a communicant as the regular worshipper in the churches of the Establishment. It is easy to rail against Dean Stanley for admitting Dr. Vance Smith to the Communion table; but if the Doctor had applied to the Rector of his own parish for the privilege, it would have been at the peril of legal penalties that the latter would have dared to refuse him. How far the Dean may have been wise in inviting a divine of well-known Unitarian sentiments is questionable; but he was within his power as a clergyman, and were it not for the Athanasian Creed staring us full in the face, it would have been rash to say that he was not acting in harmony with the spirit of the Prayer-Book. It was for the recipient himself to decide how far it was possible for him to unite in a service which involves so much to which it might have been supposed he would take exception. The Dean, at all events, showed both courage and charity in his procedure; and regarding him as a dignitary in a great national institution, there would have been much to say in his favour, were it not that the Church, in the creed which has to be recited in the Abbey a certain number of times in each year, distinctly places those who hold opinions such as Dr. Vance Smith avows outside the pale of salvation.

A still more determined advance towards the liberalising of the Church has been taken in the

course which the Dean has pursued in the services which have now for three successive years been held on St. Andrew's Day, for the promotion of the missionary work of the Church. His first step was to invite a lay member of the Church; and he selected Professor Max Müller. The choice was, to say the least, eccentric; and when it was announced, the first feeling was one of surprise at the grotesqueness and general incongruity of the arrangement, and it was not changed by the perusal of the Professor's extremely able but, as the most devout friends of Christian Missions considered, very unsatisfactory and objectionable address. The object to be attained by the appointment of such a day at all was to rouse spiritual fervour, and anything less calculated to do it—it might be said anything more fitted to repress it—than the lecture, cannot very easily be conceived. But whatever opinion be formed of his wisdom in the selection of a speaker, there remains the remarkable fact that to Dean Stanley we are indebted for the introduction of an unordained man as a lecturer in connection with a religious service in Westminster Abbey. The effect was various on different minds. It led some who hitherto had regarded the movement towards an interchange of pulpits between Churchmen and Nonconformists with favour, to look upon it more doubtfully, when they saw that the freedom they were willing to concede to Evangelical Nonconformists might open a door by which Professor Huxley might come to lecture on "Protoplasm," or Dr. Tyndall to dis-

course on the philosophy of prayer. On the other hand, others, seeing that there was nothing to hinder this—as there certainly is not, if the action in relation to Professor Max Müller be legal—may have become desirous to find some countervailing influence in the help to be derived from the services of Protestant Dissenters. It was altogether a great question which Dean Stanley had opened, and one which could not be summarily settled. It must be said, however, that the general effect was to retard rather than promote the movement for the interchange of pulpits between Churchmen and Dissenters. It certainly showed the latter—with the exception of a very few who cling to the idea of a possible alliance between those who hold what has been called "the common faith of Christendom," by which is meant the ordinary Evangelical Creed—that if this was to result in the admission of Nonconformists to the pulpits of the Establishment, the privilege must be shared with those whose beliefs were of a very different character. So far as it helped to dispel any illusion that Evangelical Dissenters might be able to secure some special advantages in a Church which still remains the National Church, it was exceedingly fortunate. There are not many who have indulged in such a dream; but it is well that even this small number should see the real state of the case. It is simply impossible to open the door so wide as to admit to these occasional services Nonconformists whose doctrines are not specially objectionable, and

who, in addition, are free from the contamination of politics, and the sin of speaking or writing against the Establishment. Law must be maintained in its integrity, or liberty recognised to the fullest extent. If the individual preferences of clergymen are to determine in whose favour the law may be relaxed, the consequences may be more serious than are at present apparent.

But as time went on the Dean took another step forward. 1873 saw an English layman occupying the lectern, but discharging the preacher's duty. 1874 found a Scotch clergyman in the same position. The choice, in this instance, was perfect in judgment. "If Anglicans are not to remain utterly isolated from all Protestant communities, and act as though, even if salvation may be found out of the pale of their Church, the right to preach cannot exist independent of their orders—if they are to show any fraternity at all, there was no one who could be so properly selected to speak in Westminster Abbey as an eminent clergyman of the sister Establishment. Dr. Caird had everything to recommend him, except his Presbyterianism. A scholar, an eminent preacher, a chaplain to the Queen, a supporter of Establishments, he lacked only the mystical grace of the Apostolical succession to make him all that could be desired. But it is certain that numbers of the clergy gnashed their teeth at the fresh dishonour done to the Abbey by the liberality of the eccentric Dean, whom they were impotent to resist.

His work, however, was not yet consummated, and in 1875 he startled the ecclesiastical world still more by inviting the veteran Nonconformist missionary, Robert Moffat, to speak on the subject on which, beyond any other man, he was most able to speak with that authority derived from a lengthened experience of a most remarkable character. The man who had civilised and evangelised a savage race ought to have been welcomed to the pulpit of any church, and it must be said that in inviting him the Dean placed his critics in an awkward dilemma. All their principles bound them to condemn the action, but there could be no better illustration of the absurdity of the principles than their issue in this particular case, and to insist upon it was to cover themselves with odium and ridicule from the great body of intelligent men of all Churches, who unanimously applauded the conduct of the Dean. If he could have let well alone, he would certainly have achieved a success. But for some reason—no doubt intelligible enough to himself, but which no one else is able to fathom—he destroyed the grace of his own act by an ill-timed and unjust attack on the Liberation Society in the afternoon of the day on which Dr. Moffat was to preach. The attack itself was as weak as it was impolitic, and had it come from any other man it would have been called ill-temper. As it was, it was marked by a violence and one-sidedness so utterly unlike the Dean, as to suggest the thought that the Establishment is the one thing for which he feels so intensely that on it he can

tolerate no difference of opinion. It is not the only indication of this kind which he has given, but it is the most striking one. By a strange coincidence, on the very evening on which he was thus assailing political Dissenters as pursuing a policy of revenge, one of them was holding him up to a meeting elsewhere as an example of breadth and liberality. The Liberation Society could have desired nothing better than such an utterance, for, in truth, it repressed the sympathy with the Establishment which the Dean's conduct was fitted to awaken, and showed that even in the case of the best men it set up a barrier of separation between the dominant Church and all others.

The courage which he has shown in most of these cases, and others that could be named, has, undoubtedly, been inspired by his earnest desire to make the National Church more comprehensive. Liberal as he is, the Establishment has no stouter or more resolute champion. It is true the institution for which he contends is so entirely different from the Established Church as it exists, or as its zealous defenders would desire to have it, that it is scarcely possible to trace a resemblance between his ideal and the actual; but this neither abates the confidence with which he speaks of it as though it answered to his theory, nor the zeal with which he upholds it. The things which others regard as its defects, he views as its glory; where they feel bound to apologise, he speaks in language of commendation; what they would esteem a reproach is to him an occasion of

rejoicing. That Dr. Pusey should be free to inculcate the practice of confession, and some Evangelical divine to hold it up as an invention of the devil; that Mr. Andrews and the Church Association should denounce Ritualism, and the editors of the *Church Times* and *Church Review* retaliate by stigmatising Protestantism; that Archdeacon Denison and Mr. Bennett should teach a doctrine closely resembling Transubstantiation, and Canon Ryle employ all his trenchant vigour to demonstrate its falsehood, and yet that all should remain in one Church, where they have to profess adherence to the same Creeds, appears to him natural and right. He does not like the violence of the extreme partisans; he deprecates any endeavour made to give either party exclusive predominance; he heartily disapproves of appeals to the law for the suppression of supposed heresy, from whichever side they may proceed, but he would have everyone teach that which he believes, and would extend to all impartially the shelter of the National Church. The State is not to endow any opinions, but to act in a religious capacity, and the Church is not regarded as a spiritual institution, but as the instrument the nation employs for the accomplishment of certain religious purposes. The State divides the nation into dioceses and parishes, it erects cathedrals and churches, it puts in some bishops, in some deans, in others rectors and curates, and they are to discharge certain religious functions as its officers. Those who accept their ministry are the

conforming, those who do not are the nonconforming members of the Church of England. The former have a monopoly of all its advantages, but the one as well as the other are members of the Church, even as they are of the State of England. A more purely Erastian theory, a theory which more thoroughly and completely degrades the Church from a spiritual into a mere political institution, it is not possible to imagine; but this, which to many would be an objection, is to the Dean an argument in its favour. He glories to profess himself an Erastian, and maintains his ground with a manliness and strength only equalled by the chivalrous courtesy he shows to opponents, unless they be political Dissenters.

The first point, however, which might strike an inquirer is, that whatever may be said in favour of the theory is an argument against the present Establishment. It does, no doubt, claim all the people as its members, but here the resemblance between it and the comprehensive Church which Dean Stanley desiderates ceases. Instead of contemplating a variety of opinions, it requires its clergy to subscribe the same Articles, to recite the same Creeds, to use the same formularies, and, therefore, if words have any meaning at all, to preach the same doctrines. It was so far from intending that a clergyman should be at liberty either to affirm or deny the idea of Baptismal Regeneration, that it has distinctly laid down its acceptance as a condition of admission into its ministry. Instead of

believing in variety, it set up Uniformity as an idol, and expelled 2,000 men who would not bow down and do it reverence. It is true the prevailing practice has been laxity, and the immunity enjoyed by all parties seems to have given it an implied sanction. But the nation has never endorsed it, and, it is tolerably certain, would repudiate it to-morrow if it was consulted on the subject. Dean Stanley's view is contradicted by history, contradicted by the letter of the formularies, contrary to the spirit and genius of the institution, and contrary to the will of the English people. If we could have an ecclesiastical *plebiscite*, the last thing it would sanction would be a Church without a creed, without a definite message to give to the nation, or rather, with a hundred different messages, so contradictory that the people are simply bewildered by the confusion.

But even the Dean shrinks from carrying out his own views to their full extent. He was so consistent as to sympathise with Mr. Bennett when he was prosecuted by the Evangelicals, and he had the chivalry to stand by Mr. Voysey up to the time of his condemnation by the Judicial Committee, and even to face the unpopularity and odium which he incurred by subscribing to the fund for his defence. But his sympathy with Mr. Voysey, or at least his countenance of the Vicar of Healaugh, ceased as soon as the Court pronounced against him. It was not in his theological opinions he was interested, but in his struggle to assert the liberty of a clergy-

man, and to maintain the comprehensiveness of the Church; and when it was found he had transgressed the law, he gave him no further support. This is very difficult to understand. It may easily be imagined that it was a very severe trial of principle to have to stand by either Mr. Bennett or Mr. Voysey in order to its consistent development. But as the Dean had not shrunk even from this, it might have been expected that he would have protested against the inconsistency of the law which tolerated the former and expelled the latter.

It is less surprising that he should be unaffected by the spectacle which the Establishment presents just now, in the encouragement which the liberty for which he pleads is giving to the growth of the worst form of priestcraft. He has under every circumstance been on the side of the assailed party in all the great ecclesiastical suits of the day, and however he might be opposed to their opinions, has always insisted on their right to a share of a great national inheritance. The result of the successive suits directed against different parties has been, he tells us, the vindication of liberty; but looked at in a more practical light, it has been the overthrow of all authority, the increase of the confusion already existing in the Establishment, and the provision of facilities for men who are seeking to lead the nation back to Rome, to carry out their designs under the sanction of a Reformed Church. How far this is affecting the faith and morality of the nation, inducing the belief that there is no certainty

in religious truth, and, what is not less dangerous, creating the idea that the most sacred obligations may be evaded by means of some strained and non-natural interpretation, or some mental reservation without moral wrong being done, is a question far too large to discuss here. There are numbers who feel it to be nothing less than a national misfortune that views of this kind should be able to shelter themselves under the authority of a man so deservedly honoured as the Dean of Westminster.

It would hardly be too much to say that there is no Church dignitary of our time who is less popular in clerical circles, or more popular outside them, than the Dean; and neither fact is at all difficult to explain. The Erastianism which suits the temper and views of politicians and men of the world generally, is extremely and properly offensive to those who believe in the divine right of their Church, or indeed have any true conception of a Church at all; and it is not the less so because there is the secret feeling that it is the only defence of the Establishment on which any reliance can be placed. Often as they hear his arguments they must be ready to exclaim, "*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis;*" and then the bitter conviction must force itself upon them, that without such help their beloved institution must infallibly perish. The High Church party must have been irritated almost beyond endurance even by his sympathy, when they found it extended with perfect impartiality to semi-rational essayists, or

the still more advanced Bishop who is, in their eyes, the scandal of the Church, and heard the plea of comprehensiveness, on which their own continuance in the Church was justified, urged also on behalf of teachers whom they esteem the enemies of all religion. The Dean too, though the very soul of chivalry and gentleness, is a keen and outspoken controversialist. No man could be more charitable in his judgments of men: indeed it would be more correct to say that no man could more carefully and conscientiously abstain from judgments of men altogether. But he is as firm and uncompromising in his defence of right principles as he is considerate in his treatment of their antagonists, while they, in their turn, too often reverse his practice, and make up for the feebleness with which they defend their own position by the bitterness of their attacks upon its skilful assailant.

The same reasons which make clerics distrust and dislike him, attract the outside world to him. The charm of his learning and his manner is, of course, felt more or less by all, for the theological prejudices must be strong indeed which could make anyone insensible to the attractions of one of the most accomplished and agreeable men in the kingdom. A large body of the laity, however, have no such prejudice to overcome, and they like the Dean all the better because he is not too exact and precise in his theology. Definite religious teaching may be a good cry for a school-board election, but it would excite no sympathy beyond a very narrow

circle, and the Dean is widely honoured for his superiority to distinctions which are assumed to be of slight importance. The unwise modes of action which have been adopted towards him have done a great deal to increase this feeling in his favour. Candid men contrast his spirit with that of his assailants, and they feel there can be no hesitation as to the side to which their sympathies must incline. The latest example of the petty persecution to which he has from time to time been exposed, was the attempt to exclude him from the pulpit of the University of Oxford, and the result was what might have been expected, a great increase of his popularity and the utter discomfiture of his opponents, the inconsistency of whose position destroyed the force of their protests against what they believed to be error.

The Dean is a prolific author, but his hand loses nothing of its cunning by constant exercise. His style is always charming, and he seldom touches a subject without presenting it in some new light and adorning it with fresh beauty. In his noble Catholic spirit, he is specially fond of doing honour to departed worthies whose creed and ecclesiastical associations were different from his own. Thus at Bedford he pronounced a magnificent eulogy on John Bunyan; at Kidderminster, one not less striking on Richard Baxter; and still more recently he came out of the solitude into which his heavy sorrow has plunged him, to speak of the great work of John and Charles Wesley. He has a wonderful

skill in biographical analysis and sketch, as is attested in the various funeral sermons he has preached in the Abbey for the great men who during his administration have been interred within its walls. His enemies say that he desires to turn the Abbey into a Walhalla, that he may have the opportunity of pronouncing the funeral orations of the heroes, but even envy cannot deny the exquisite beauty and real suggestiveness of these remarkable productions. A collection of them would be a very interesting contribution to the literary, scientific, and ecclesiastical history of the times. If there is somewhat too eager an anxiety, even in these utterances, to suggest some plea for his loved Establishment, it is not well to be too severe on this excess of earnestness. It may be questioned, however, whether at Nonconformist gatherings, in which the Dean has more than once joined, the introduction of such suggestions is in good taste or is calculated to advance the end he has in view. Still those who have a faith themselves will not judge harshly one whose only fault is that he is so possessed by his own, that he is instant in season and out of season in its promotion. They may be all the more disposed to be lenient if they remember that the Establishment he defends exists only in his imagination, or at most within his Abbey, and that his commendations of it involve the severest censures on the actual institution with which they have to deal.

His theological writings cannot be satisfactory to

those who hold fast by the Evangelical creed. Whatever be our admiration of the man, there are numbers who regard the influence which he is exerting upon the religious opinion of the country as most disastrous. It is impossible, however, on that account to sympathise with those who, while they owe their own place in the Establishment to the recognition of the principles he advocates, would deprive him of the liberty which they are pushing to as great an extreme in an opposite direction. The full consideration of objections to the Dean's theology is not within the province of a sketch like this, but that silence does not indicate an inability to appreciate their seriousness. The evil resulting from the prevalent contempt of dogma, which is often as supercilious as it is unintelligent, is not easily estimated, and the Dean's teaching has unquestionably helped to foster it. But it is pleasanter to part from him thinking of him as the true-hearted Christian gentleman, the gallant champion of what he believes right, the fascinating writer, the diligent worker in the cause of freedom and progress. Even in their greatest differences from him, Dissenters can only wish that their own cause had many defenders as noble in spirit, as loyal at heart, and as eloquent and able in speech as the Dean of Westminster.

THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

THE infinite variety of opinion which prevails in the Anglican Church is hardly more remarkable than the unanimity which its several parties—with the exception of Broad Churchmen—differing on all beside, show in relation to the bishops. The presence of certain members of the Bench on the late Judicial Committee might have been expected to secure for the Court the confidence of the clergy; but, on the contrary, it seemed to be the element which was regarded with most distrust—a distrust, strange to say, expressed with special vehemence by the party who hold the most advanced sacerdotalism, and contend most strenuously for the rights of their Church and their order. But if Ritualists are outrageously violent in their language, the Evangelicals are not far behindhand, and, indeed, though the clergy and the journals of the former party are more loud and unmeasured in their denunciations, there is no layman of the Anglican section who has rated the bishops so soundly, and who, in

general, has shown such contempt for their administration, as Lord Shaftesbury. The Bishop of Peterborough has more than once taken him up somewhat sharply, and with evident relish for the task; but it is unfortunate for his lordship and his colleagues that the sympathies of the Peers were so unmistakably with their assailant rather than with them. One of the strongest proofs of this was furnished by the history of the Public Worship Act. That Bill, as pointed out in the sketch of the Primate, was intended by him to extend the influence of the bishops, by giving them a large discretion in the regulation of ritual, but has been so transformed, chiefly by the action of Lord Shaftesbury, that its tendency is rather in the opposite direction, and the net result of the discussion is that the bishops are humiliated.

We are often told that the cause of this disbelief in its rulers, so unfortunate for any Church, is to be found in the vacillation and weakness of the bishops themselves, but it may be traced quite as much to the lawless temper of those whom they have to govern. Churchmen are proud enough of the glory of the Establishment, but they have that dislike to its restraints which perhaps is natural enough in freeborn Englishmen. As the keenest Tories amongst us are the first to resent any measure of repression which touches themselves, however willing they may be to employ it against others, so the fiercest zealots for Church authority only maintain it with the tacit reserve that they shall themselves be free to dispute its jurisdiction. The

Ritualist priest may have a very exalted conception of the position of authority which belongs to him as a legitimate descendant of the Apostles, of the deference which his parishioners should render him, and, above all, of the impassable nature of the wide gulf which separates him from all Dissenting teachers; but when he is required to carry out his own principles in his relations to his Bishop, and to recognise the dignity and authority which, on his theory, must centre in one through whom the mystic grace on which so much depends is transmitted, he seems strangely oblivious of all his previous assertions, and talks and acts in a spirit of the wildest independence. It is a strange inconsistency, not peculiar to Anglican priests, but certainly so strongly developed among them, that the most lawless class in the country (Mr. Maccoll's defence of their position notwithstanding) at present are men whose political and ecclesiastical views would enforce on them the duty of submission to the powers that be. No institution, from the Crown and the House of Lords downwards, has immunity from their attacks. No office, however venerable it ought to be in their eyes, is exempt from their rude and almost revolutionary criticism. No one, whatever his personal excellence or his official status, can cross their path or interfere with their views without being made the target against which their poisoned darts are directed. The Evangelicals, or at least their clergy, are under much greater restraint; and if Lord Shaftesbury,

by the vehemence of his occasional diatribes, and the *Record* and the *Rock*, with a fierce bigotry which almost equals that of the *Church Times*, even if it does not reduce them to the level of the defunct *Herald*, do something to compensate for this comparative moderation, yet it must be said that their opponents carry off the palm for unscrupulous and passionate violence.

The conduct of both parties, however, is sufficient to show that the evils of which the Church has to complain are not all due to the weakness of her rulers, and that if the bishops had been as definite in their views, as resolute in their purposes, and as strong and decided in action as those who are most ready to complain of their inefficiency could have desired them to be, their position would not have been more easy. It is not possible, indeed, to say what might have been the consequences if all the bishops had agreed upon a policy and carried it out firmly; for even if they could have compelled obedience, they might, on the other hand, have provoked a fierce resistance, whose issue must have been the overthrow of the Establishment. That, in truth, is the peril ever present to the eyes of statesmen and ecclesiastics, and the seriousness which it assumes in their eyes is indicated by the dread they entertain of strong men and strong measures. The Church, as the nation is continually reminded, is built on compromise, and if it is to be maintained, its affairs must be administered by men who understand this and will act

accordingly. There is no objection on the part of politicians to include among her clergy men with opinions as extreme in their antagonism as Canon Ryle and Archdeacon Denison, or even Mr. Molyneux (if he would have consented to accept the position) and Mr. Bennett, but there is a very great reluctance to give such men a position which would enable them to enforce their opinions upon others. It is useless, therefore, to speculate as to the effect which might be produced by the combined action of a strong Bench of Bishops, for it is perfectly certain that we shall never in the present state of things have such a body. It is possible that an episcopate composed of men of the decided opinions and with the strong will of the present Bishop of Durham, might have prevented the Ritualistic party attaining the position they at present hold in the Church; but it is simply impossible to conceive of such a Bench. The complaints about the bishops are, in fact, somewhat inconsistent and unreasonable. Extreme moderation has been, in the eyes of most Ministers, one of the highest recommendations for the office; and yet when bishops, appointed on this ground in times of difficulty, show the hesitation, uncertainty, and feebleness natural to men of their type, they are censured. It would be well Churchmen should understand that they cannot find in the same person the prudent caution which will be a guarantee for the safety of an Establishment which, spite of its show of greatness and strength,

is in the eyes of its friends always in the most imminent danger of destruction, and the determined and energetic temper which is able to quell internal disorter and resist external attack.

This may seem rather a long and at first sight irrelevant introduction to a sketch of Dr. Baring, but in truth it has all had direct relation to him. The Bishop of Durham is one of the few prelates of our day who has always had a mind of his own, and who has been resolved, at whatever cost to himself, to embody it in his administration. He stands at the opposite end of the line from the feeble Bishop of London. The one seems "tossed to and fro, carried away," if not "with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness:" the other has not only a fixed creed, but a very strong conception of his own duty in relation to it. Dr. Jackson will sometimes talk very fairly, but he neutralises all his Protestant professions by such an act as the appointment of Mr. Berdmore Compton to All Saints. Dr. Baring's words are more decided; but, what is better still, his words are as his deeds. There is no reason to suppose that there is any radical difference between the two men in their conceptions of episcopal rights, but it seems as if the one conceived that the great end of his rule should be to quiet all dissensions and make things comfortable for all parties, whereas the other feels that he is set for the defence of the Gospel, and is ready to sacrifice personal ease and popularity in order to attain that. No

High Church bishop has yet ventured to act with the same determination as the Bishop of Durham, and if one of this character should arise and press as severely upon the Evangelicals as Dr. Baring has done upon the Ritualists, he might very speedily arouse a storm which it would be impossible to allay. Hitherto, however, there has been no prelate of this school who has shown the same vigour. The late Bishop of Salisbury was as advanced and outspoken in his sacèrdotal as his brother at Durham is in his evangelical opinions, and how far he might have compromised his order and perilled the Establishment, had his life been longer and his physical strength equal to his mental vigour and ecclesiastical zeal, it is needless now to speculate, for he was carried off before it was possible for him to effect much. The present Bishop of Chichester is perhaps equally extreme, but he is a poor weakling, whose appointment—one of the most discreditable made by the late Premier—has always been a puzzle. The Bishop of Durham may fairly be regarded as the most decided representative of episcopal authority on the Bench, and he employs it for the maintenance of the Protestantism of the Establishment. That he has accomplished a great deal in his own diocese cannot be questioned, though even there he has not been able to stamp out Ritualism; but beyond the Evangelical circle he enjoys comparatively little credit for the resolution he has displayed, and there are numbers even of the Protestant party in the

Church who, though they are alarmed at the rapid development of Romanising tendencies, are not prepared to see them handled so roughly.

The Bishop is one of Lord Shaftesbury's nominees, one of the most characteristic products of those halcyon days of Evangelicalism, when Lord Palmerston atoned for all his own heresies by allowing Lord Shaftesbury to appoint good prelates. Lord Shaftesbury has recently received applause from quarters whence hitherto very different sounds have proceeded; and the well-known and able organ of extreme Erastianism in the weekly press—in one of those gushing fits of emotion by which it is sometimes overcome, and in which it seems fairly to lose its head—showed its intense admiration of his lordship's amendment of the Primate's Bill by regretting that he had not, instead of becoming the head of a narrow ecclesiastical clique, devoted himself to statesmanship, in which he might have obtained eminence. The idea of his impulsive lordship, with his singularly narrow and one-sided intellect, which never seems to admit a doubt of its own infallibility, or to recognise the possibility of honest and conscientious difference of opinion, playing the part of a great statesman, is somewhat daring, even for a journal possessed of such marvellous insight into the minds of men and such a remarkable power of forecasting the future. Its representations are, indeed, subject to this unfortunate deduction, that men have the art of showing themselves the very opposite of all that it has painted them, and

events a singular tendency to falsify all its predictions. It reminds one of a man who got great credit as a weather authority, on the ground that a day was sure always to turn out the opposite to what he foretold. When the principle was once understood, his prophecies were as useful as those of the most correct seer. It was only necessary to interpret his prediction as Rory O'More interpreted his dreams, by contraries. But the journalist's Erastianism must have made him more than ordinarily sanguine when he dreamed that Lord Shaftesbury might have been a statesman.

Lord Shaftesbury had an opportunity of showing his statesmanlike qualities, when the Prime Minister of the day thought it wise to consult him as to the appointment of bishops, and, in fact, in many cases virtually left the appointment in his hands. If he had been able to comprehend the situation, and to show that breadth of sympathy, appreciation of the true interests of the Church, and sagacity in the judgment of individuals demanded for the right discharge of such a trust, that is, if he had really been a statesman, he would have earned a high reputation for himself, and have done good service to the Church. But never was failure more conspicuous. He nominated none but men of his own school, and in some cases not its most distinguished members, because he took care generally to select those of his own order. The Barings, Villierses, Pelhams, and Bickersteths were not only Evangelical, but they had also aristocratic connections, and these were

sufficient to give them the advantage over other clergymen, in many respects possessed of greater merit, who belonged to a less distinguished circle. Perhaps Evangelical doctrines might be regarded by politicians as having on them a stamp of vulgarity, against which it was desirable to provide some corrective, and therefore it was necessary to select men who had a place among the "upper ten thousand." It would have been intolerable to appoint as a successor to the prince Bishops of Durham one who was not only an Evangelical, but a plebeian as well; and so a Villiers was appointed in the first instance, and when his career was prematurely ended, he was followed by another of the same class in the person of Dr. Baring. It must be said, in fairness to Lord Shaftesbury, that if he was determined to limit his choice to the members of the Evangelical school, his material was very scanty. There were Evangelical men outside the school altogether whose appointment would have been creditable to him, and more widely satisfactory; but of that wider view, surely an essential of a statesman, Lord Shaftesbury was incapable; and so an Alford was left at the deanery of Canterbury, while Dr. Baring found his way first to the See of Gloucester and Bristol, and afterwards to that of Durham.

Without any wish to depreciate his lordship, indeed, with a hearty admiration of the manliness and decision he has shown in his policy, it may still be said that the grounds for his elevation to the episcopate are not easy to discover. He was a

sincere Evangelical, and an Evangelical of good family, and that, perhaps, ought to be regarded as decisive. Assuredly it was so in those times, when the Evangelical party got so many mitres and lost so much of its old vitality and strength. During the Shaftesbury *régime*, the *Saturday Review* and other High Church journals were fond of sneering at the want of learning in the Evangelical bishops, Unquestionably they made too much of the point, for most of these prelates had obtained some collegiate distinction, and in some instances had taken high honours; and if in after life their devotion to the work of preaching had prevented them from prosecuting their studies, that could hardly be urged as a disqualification for episcopal office. Dr. Baring graduated with honours at Oxford, and, though he has not given any subsequent indications of scholarly power, he is a man of fair attainments. Beyond that there is little or nothing to be said. What work he has done, or what indication of distinguished abilities he has given, which would have led an impartial distributor of Church patronage to fix on him as one clearly marked out for promotion, is certainly not known to the world at large. That he was successful as a preacher in attracting large congregations it is easy to believe, for Evangelical preachers with very moderate powers are pretty sure to secure this kind of success, and not the less so if they are of good social standing. In short, he had not given any evidence of power or done any such service to the Church as to warrant a belief

that if he had not been a Baring he would ever have been Bishop of Durham.

Still, being Bishop, it must be said in all fairness that he has discharged the duties of his position with great conscientiousness, and has proved himself a vigorous ruler. There can be no question about his fidelity to Evangelical principles, and his conviction that he has a right—and, indeed, something more than a right, an absolute obligation—to employ all the influence of his high office for their promotion, and his earnest desire to reduce that conviction to practice. It is very difficult to comprehend the position of a man who believes that the founders of the Anglican Establishment meant to set up an Evangelical Protestant Church, or that the Prayer-Book and formularies can be made on any rational principles of interpretation to accord with such a view. Assuredly the divines who gave it its final shape were as far as possible removed themselves from the modern Evangelical position, and it is a singular fact if they prepared a Liturgy which, so far from expressing their own opinions, was distinctly opposed to them. It is not, however, for us to constitute ourselves judges of other men's consciences. There are numbers of good men who can rest in this view, and among them is the Bishop of Durham; and as he sincerely holds it, he deserves honour for the consistency and the strength with which he maintains it. There is something in his position and surroundings, as well perhaps as in his own character, to beget and develop that idea of

authority which is more marked in him than in most other prelates. The See of Durham has a traditional grandeur attached to it, so that the dignity of a ruler seems more becoming in the occupant of its throne than (say) in either of his neighbours of Carlisle and Ripon. Its majestic cathedral, towering aloft as the most conspicuous object in the district, and seeming to assert the sway of its venerable antiquity over the busy modern life by which it is encompassed, is a fitting symbol of the power which was attached to a see whose prelates were formerly princes, and were not afraid to vie even with the dignitaries of York. Called to such a position, with a deep sense of the responsibilities which it involved and an intense dislike to Ritualistic innovations, Dr. Baring evidently felt that he was come to his kingdom for such a time as this, and he has most honestly and earnestly sought to prove himself equal to the demands made upon him.

Ritualism is not perhaps very well suited to the hard, rugged soil of the northern region over which Dr. Baring presides. Still, High Anglicanism had a position, though not a very strong one, in the diocese long before it had developed into its modern form. For more than thirty years Newcastle has had a church of an advanced type, whose melancholy bell, ringing out its unmusical "ding dong" day by day, reminded the inhabitants of that Radical borough that there were in it some witnesses to truths which were so widely forgotten. But the chosen home of High Anglicanism in the diocese is

67701

the little town of Morpeth, and its chief representative its rector, the well-known Hon. and Rev. F. R. Grey. Mr. Grey is to the north of England very much what Archdeacon Denison is to the south and west. He has not, indeed, anything like the same ability or eloquence, but he is as fearless in spirit, as uncompromising in principle, as bent on the assertion of his rights, in his own parish as little disposed to respect the dicta of his Bishop, as the great Archdeacon. In him Dr. Baring has, as was to be anticipated; found a most resolute opponent. The struggle between them has been waged with varying success, but it is to the credit of the Bishop that he has been just as decided in his conduct towards this aristocratic rector, with all the power of the Greys at his back, as he could have been to the humblest curate in his diocese.

But the principal quarrel in which Dr. Baring has been embroiled, and that in which he has most exposed himself to the anger of the High Church party, is his contest with Dr. Dykes, an incumbent in his diocese, relative to the licensing of curates. Dr. Dykes was a pronounced Ritualist, very decided, very unbending, and not, if we are to judge by appearances, at all unwilling to play the *rôle* of a martyr. The Bishop, unable to repress his extravagances in ritual, determined to employ one weapon which he had in his armory, and to cripple the work of the recusant incumbent by refusing to license the curates whom he considered necessary to the carrying out of his plans. At first sight the

proceeding seems high-handed, but the more it is examined the less ground is there for objecting to it. The Bishop did not attempt to prescribe to Dr. Dykes either as to the number of his curates or as to the school from which to select them. He simply demanded from them, as the condition of their obtaining his license, a promise that they would obey the law on certain points, and from the Rector, on the other hand, that he would not ask them to be guilty of certain specified acts of disobedience. Surely this was not going out of his proper province, or exacting anything more than he, as the representative of the law, was not only entitled but bound to enforce. It is hardly possible to conceive of a similar case occurring at the present time in any other department of the State, unless indeed the insubordination shown by some of our young cadets under instruction might suggest the idea that in the army a like spirit might under special circumstances discover itself. Suppose that a state of things should arise in which a certain number of the officers were resolved on defying law, would it be thought a violent stretch of authority on the part of a commanding officer if, before placing any young lieutenants on his staff, he exacted a declaration from them that they would not become accomplices in the disloyalty? Or would any heed be given to their complaints if they were to insist that they were unjustly treated, and were prevented from conducting the operations they intended from lack of subordinates, especially if no

such lack would have been felt at all but for their determination to persist in a plan of action which the law had condemned? This is precisely the case of a Ritualist rector subjected to such terms as those imposed by Dr. Baring. He may be doing a good work, and he may have a large number of services demanding the constant attention of himself and curates, of whom, therefore, it may be extremely awkward for him to be deprived. But the very necessity for which he is so anxious to provide arises out of those High Church opinions which lie at the root of the whole difficulty, and it is not to be expected that the Bishop will therefore be disposed to modify his action. So much is said of the incessant labours of these extreme Anglicans, and of the claim they establish by their devoted labours, that it is fortunate to find a clergyman like Mr. Capes, who can talk about them in the language of common sense, and who plainly says that "the waste of labour among the existing English clergy is enormous." "Consider," he says, the total throwing away of a clergyman's time which results from his modern fashion of reading the Morning or Evening Service (or both of them) every day in the week. . . . Including the going to and fro, the breaking into other occupations, and the time spent in the vestry, it must compel the loss, taking one day with another, of at least one hour and a half daily; that is, of nine hours every week." For what object? A great show of work is made, but with what result? A clergyman full of the zeal and ideas of this High school comes into a

parish, and immediately sets to work to make up for the *laches* of his predecessor. Every day there must be one or two services; the bell rings for a quarter of an hour before each in the most dismal manner, very much to the disturbance of any unhappy student who may be within the range of its unmusical notes, and the rector himself or some one of his curates may be seen going to conduct the service with a rapidity which tells the world that he at least is full of work. And for what? For two or three—under favourable conditions perhaps eight or ten—people whom he collects to hear him go through the same form as he observed yesterday and will observe to-morrow. "Putting a man's real power of *bonâ-fide* work," says Mr. Capes, "at six hours a day, daily Morning and Evening Service involves the loss of one whole day and a half every week, all of which might be devoted to his personal cultivation, and to remedy the defects of his original education as a thinker and a theologian." Well may he ask, then, if in any parish there are really a few persons—these will chiefly be women with nothing to do—who desire daily prayers, why should they not be read by a layman?

Of course, if the Anglican clergy will have these services, and add to them the work of confessing any who can be persuaded to come to them as penitents, they will have their time fully occupied, and an incumbent bent on working out the ideal of the Ritualist school will need a large staff of curates. It does not at all follow, however, that

a bishop who disapproves of these practices should be greatly moved by the plea that if he will not allow incumbent and curates to break the law, or will insist upon their promising to keep it, the overburdened rector will be unequal to the work. He might be rather inclined to say: "The people will be all the better, or certainly none the worse, for very much of it being left undone altogether." It is said, indeed, that the Bishop demands more than submission to the law, but such an allegation rests entirely on the determination of his opponents to ignore certain decisions of the Judicial Committee. They do not like them, and therefore they cannot be law, for with the Ritualists that only is law which they choose to obey themselves or wish to enforce upon others. But the Bishop cannot respect such notions unless he is prepared to do as others of his order have done, and virtually make himself superior to the Courts by conniving at the practices they have condemned.

Dr. Baring is, of course, the "pet aversion" of the Ritualists. Possibly they are more contemptuous towards Bishop Ellicott or Lord Arthur Hervey, but their bitterness against the Bishop of Durham has not been often surpassed in our ecclesiastical strifes even by this violent party. Even those who most differ from them might yet still sympathise with their protests against tyranny, if they could see that the action to which they object could be fairly thus described; but out of their own mouth, and by their own principles, they are condemned.

They fret under the restraints of law, and complain that secular Courts should dictate as to the doctrine and ritual of the Church; but they are nevertheless content that the State should pronounce what is the true doctrine, and exclude from the benefits of the national religion all who will not conform to it. The wrongs of Nonconformists do not disturb them; they complain only of the injury done themselves in their not being permitted at once to enjoy the patronage the State has to give, and to spurn the control it claims to exercise. Nor, indeed, do they like the rule of the Church any better than that of the State, and are as swift—perhaps even more swift—to speak evil of the dignities of the one than of those of the other. According to them, the possession of the three orders of the ministry—bishops, priests, and deacons—is one distinctive and essential note of Catholicity, but it would seem as if they intended bishops to be nothing better than figure-heads, to give a certain character to their system, and are resolved that as little authority as possible shall be conceded to them.

Now even those who love independence may well refuse to approve this kind of insolent lawlessness. The scenes at Bath, for example, when, first at the Congress itself, and then in a meeting he himself had summoned, Archdeacon Denison denounced the tyranny of bishops, especially pointing to his own Diocesan and the Bishop of Durham, would have been a scandal to any community. It is not necessary to endorse all

his lordship's proceedings in order to condemn this mode of attack. To pronounce absolutely on the merits of the controversy would require an intimate acquaintance with all its details. But those who have not this may still recognise the Bishop as a man who is fighting a hard battle, and doing it with a dogged firmness and contempt of the vulgar assaults to which he has been exposed, which are indispensable to success. With a wider intellect and a greater capacity for entering into the difficulties of others, he could hardly have taken so strong a position; but he is conscientious if narrow, and sincere if dogmatic; he has an unquenchable faith in the principles of his school and the rights of his office, and he is thus well qualified for a conflict with the unscrupulous party who are bent on revolutionising the Church. Even those who do not sympathise with all his principles or approve of all his procedure, may feel that if ever there was a struggle in which his trenchant vigour was demanded, it is that into which circumstances have forced him.

The year 1875 gave Dr. Baring an opportunity of proving that he had not succumbed to the emasculating influences which seem to tell so powerfully upon the episcopal bench. The plea that was urged, during the discussion on the Public Worship Act, in favour of the power which was to be committed to their lordships, that their position in the world and their accessibility to "statesmanslike considerations," combined with their desire to

maintain the authority of the Establishment, made them peculiarly fitted to decide when suits should be instituted against clerical transgressors, received only too much confirmation from their conduct in the issue of the Allocution. One sometimes wonders whether that document was discussed in conclave, and if so, to whom the world is indebted for the clauses which seemed so carefully intended to neutralise each other, that a careful perusal of the document left it doubtful at the end what their real opinion was. The general effect, undoubtedly, was to encourage the Ritualist, and yet Dr. Moberley refused to sign the manifesto, because, in his view, it compromised sacerdotal rights. On the other hand, Dr. Baring was equally decided in his protest against what he esteemed infidelity to Protestant truth. Both men are to be honoured for their courageous resolution not to bow down to that idol of compromise which it had pleased their brethren to set up. The one could not understand why the priests were to be censured for the alienation between them and their people, if the people were actuated by that spirit of unjust suspicion which was attributed to them. The other was equally unable to perceive why such a charge should be brought against the laity, if they had to do with priests whose action was tending to assimilate the Anglican Church to that of Rome. The part which the Bishop of Durham had to take, however, was more difficult than that of his brother of Salisbury. It is always a difficult thing for a

man to occupy an independent position, separating himself from the rest of his order, and incurring that odium to which such a display of his independence must expose him. But Dr. Moberley had, at least, the assurance that the clerical sentiment would be in his favour, whereas Dr. Baring could only count on the sympathy of those who, while desirous of upholding the Establishment, were resolved to maintain its Protestant character. It is sad to think how unpopular the Protestant name and idea has become among a large body of the Anglican clergy, and how hard, therefore, is the task imposed upon a Bishop who is resolved to walk in the old paths, and hold fast by the principles of Latimer and Hooper. Dr. Baring, indeed, might well wonder why he should stand alone in his resolve. Where was his neighbour of Ripon, once known as a decided Protestant? Or why was Dr. Pelham, of Norwich, found wanting at such a crisis? Nay, he might have felt surprised that the Primate himself should thus stoop to parley with foes who have always shown themselves so full of bitterness to himself, and whose Romanising conspiracy he had denounced with such forcible eloquence? It was to his honour that he was not seduced by their weakness, and was content to stand alone, "faithful found among the many faithless."

Of course he was denounced by time-servers as an extreme and impracticable man; but such censures would have little weight with one who is bent on doing his duty with all fearlessness and

simplicity. He has his reward, not only in the testimony of his own conscience, but in the respect of all true men. The demonstration in his honour, when he appeared on the platform in Exeter Hall last May, assured him that there are numbers who know how to appreciate his loyalty to truth. Even his enemies, while they declaim against his bigotry and brand him as a despot, as they would brand every man who ventured to oppose their plans, are compelled to pay a reluctant homage to his integrity and straightforwardness. The Establishment might be in more immediate peril if it had more of such prelates, but it would at least die with dignity if it was to fall in consequence of a firm stand made on behalf of a great principle; and the Church would be all the stronger and purer if she had rulers who were resolved that, whatever came of status and emoluments, the truth she has to maintain should not be compromised or surrendered. But it is vain to hope for many men of this type among the prelates of an Erastian Establishment.

CANON PUSEY.

THE century which has now run three-fourths of its course has witnessed changes amounting to nothing short of a revolution in the Anglican Church; and Dr. Pusey, whose life has extended over the period, may certainly say, in relation to them, *Quorum pars magna fui.* For good or for evil, he has associated his name and influence with the Church of which he is so devoted a son, and to whose principles he has given so remarkable and unexpected a development. Though he was not the author of the movement which bore his name until it took one expressing its distinctively Ritualistic character, he has long been acknowledged as its most eminent representative; and while other men have gone forward in a line to which he has never shown himself strongly disposed, he has always extended to them his sympathy, while they in their turn have cherished for him a reverential confidence as the patriarch of their faith. From his quiet home at Oxford, the ascetic scholar — respected for his sincere devotion, as for his great learning, by all who are

capable of rising above the narrowing influences of party feeling in their judgments of individual character—has wielded, and continues to wield, a power among the clergy to which no bishop can pretend—it might almost be said, beyond that of the whole Bench combined. The enjoyment of such a position is itself a proof of very high qualities in the man who holds it; but it must also involve immense responsibility, from which it is impossible to escape.

A teacher who has raised up a school of his own, committed to a view of the Church's mission and doctrine which, whether it be a restoration or an innovation, is certainly revolutionary in its character and results, must be prepared to answer for all the consequences which may follow. Grave as these are already, they are as yet but imperfectly developed. The point which Ritualism has reached, extreme as it may appear, is not, and cannot be, the ultimatum; and though there is for the moment a strange and unexpected lull in the conflict which its advances have provoked, it is not to be supposed that it will be left undisturbed even in the positions which it at present occupies. How pending controversies will be settled,—whether Evangelicals will accept as hard necessities the later, as they have acquiesced in the earlier, Ritualistic changes; whether this will encourage the aggressive party to still further demands, until at last they reach a point which even the tameness of the Evangelical clergy cannot

brook,—are questions which time only can resolve. But whatever be the course of events, to Dr. Pusey, more than any other man, must ever attach the responsibility for them. Anglicanism as taught in the Tracts has given its character to the ecclesiastical movements of the age, and Dr. Pusey has stamped the impress of his own thought and feeling on Anglicanism. He is an apostle or heresiarch, as men agree with or differ from him. Some ardent Low Churchmen do not shrink from describing him as Antichrist, or, with that fatal tendency seen in not a few of them to regard all who differ from them as of infernal origin, as a child of the devil; while his followers, on the other side, are equally loud in their eulogies of his saintly spirit and almost supernatural wisdom. By all alike he is regarded as the Coryphæus of the new school, and has to face the criticism as well as to receive the honours incident to such an elevation.

Even the advanced years which may often be reasonably pleaded in arrest of severe if righteous judgment upon men who have been decided and even violent party leaders in their youth, cannot be allowed to mitigate any condemnation which may be fairly due to his teaching and influence. The lapse of time naturally has, and ought to have, an influence in softening the asperities of controversy, and especially in qualifying our estimates of those who have been active in the struggle. But it is quite possible to allow this tendency to become too strong. Dr. Pusey, as a man, as a Christian, and

as a scholar, ought to be held in the highest respect, and it would be an outrage on all sense of justice as well as on all Christian feeling, if any difference of opinion should induce us to withhold the tribute of honour which is due to him in all these capacities. But there is need for caution lest this admiration of his intellectual and spiritual qualities should pass into an unwarranted and dangerous deference to his authority, or even into a passive acquiescence in his teachings, as though it were impossible that so good a man should be so dangerous a guide. In his case the peril is increased by the reverence which his age commands. To all the fascination of power he adds the subtle but real, and in truth legitimate, influence of years of unchallenged consistency, and unwearied service to the faith to which his soul has been yielded. When therefore he comes, as on great occasions he has done, even in late years, into the arena, bearing the scars of his many hard-fought fields, every sentiment of chivalry compels admiration of the veteran who shows all the gallantry and spirit of a youthful champion. The feeling is strengthened by the devotion of his own party, many of whom seem to regard it as little short of impiety to question the utterances of one entitled on every ground to such absolute deference. That he should have been able to inspire such enthusiasm, and should retain the hold which it gives him over a younger generation, who have in many points diverged, if not from his principles, at all events from his policy, is a

marked evidence of power, and of a power which is so likely to affect others beyond the circle of his immediate sympathisers, that it needs caution to prevent it from telling unduly upon our judgments. If, indeed, the evil which Dr. Pusey has wrought had passed away, or were even giving signs that its vitality was declining, and that the time in which its influence justified anxiety was almost over, there would be less reason to regret any special favour shown to the individual. But so far is this from being the case, that it is only now that the full extent of the mischief is beginning to be appreciated. There was a time when it seemed as though the most serious harm to be apprehended was the secession to Rome of a certain number of those who had imbibed his ideas of Church authority without the qualifications which have kept him loyal to the Church of his fathers. But serious as that loss might have been, and in the case of some actually was, to the Anglican Church, it was a small matter as compared with the assimilation of the Church itself to Dr. Pusey's ideal, which has gone on to such an alarming extent, and which, unless some strong corrective measures be adopted, will go still further. To all who believe that the transformation is a calamity for the Establishment, for the cause of Protestantism, and for the general interests of religion, Dr. Pusey, however sincere and able, must appear as a minister of evil; and it would be a mere abuse of charity to allow it to restrain strong censure of his teaching and conduct because of the

purity of aim, the sincerity of piety, and the integrity of character which all must recognise in the teacher. There was a time when the condemnation of opinions was too readily extended to their professors, and especially to their teachers. At present, on the contrary, there is a disposition to suffer the recognition of personal excellence in the apostles of error to pass into a dangerous, not to say criminal, indifference to the nature of the principles they are disseminating.

In order to a right understanding of the great High Church leader, it is necessary at once to get rid of the idea that he is a Jesuit in disguise, who has been working in the interests of Rome, and who, if he had been true to his own convictions, would long since have followed his illustrious *confrère*, and sought a home in the Infallible Church. There is undoubtedly so much that favours such a view, that those who take it are hardly to be accused of extreme prejudice or bigotry. The doctrines Dr. Pusey has taught are, with slight exceptions, those which the world has been accustomed to regard as distinctively Romish; and the idea of the Church and her authority, which is at the foundation of his system, is one which, if consistently carried out, would lead to the recognition of the Papal supremacy. In many respects, too, it may be thought that he was more likely to have proved a dutiful son of the Church than the distinguished Oratorian so long his companion. Both of them have that ascetic spirit, and those scholastic tastes, which

would have qualified them to be the heads of monastic bodies devoted exclusively to works of learning and piety; but the spirit of independence which has irritated the Romish Church, and caused her, with singular short-sightedness, to neglect the most illustrious pervert she has made for generations, is not so strongly developed in Dr. Pusey as in Father Newman. Perhaps when they were associated as the heads of the Tractarian party, most observers would have thought that the secession of the one would involve that of both; and if a distinction had been made, the general expectation would probably have been that Pusey would have gone, and Newman have remained. The Church of Rome was worthy of neither of them. Her subtle and insidious policy finds much more fitting representatives in the men of more supple intellects, and of less sensitive consciences, for whom her smiles are reserved, and to whom her great prizes fall. Dr. Pusey would not have made a sufficiently flexible instrument, and it is probable that he would never have worn the episcopal mitre. But it is doubtful whether he would have proved so intractable, or even have exposed himself to censure such as the *Dublin Review* has directed against his old friend and ally.

It would, in the judgment of decided Protestants, have been a more fortunate thing for the Anglican Church if Dr. Pusey had taken what seemed his proper place at the head of the large number of his disciples whom the Gorham Judgment forced into the arms of Rome. But there

is not the slightest reason for a suspicion of his high conscientiousness. We may dissent alike from his principles, and his mode of applying them: we may hold his logic as faulty as his theology is erroneous; but of his sincerity there ought to be no question. If there were any ground for impeaching or even hinting a doubt of it, there is no man who might so naturally be expected to feel and to express it as Dr. Newman; for, in such case, it would be to him not only a sign of cowardice, but a breach of friendship and a destruction of their old confidence. Together they had raised a protest against what they deemed the fallacies and impieties of Protestantism. Together they had set forth certain views of the Church and her doctrines, which had exposed them to popular odium and ecclesiastical censure. Together they had advanced to the brink of the Rubicon, and if, when the moment came for crossing, the one drew back and left his friend to brave its dangers alone, the latter might well have complained of desertion if he could have supposed that there was any reason for the hesitation which separated them at such a crisis, except sincere conviction. But, instead of complaining, Dr. Newman bears the most honourable and convincing testimony to the high principle by which Dr. Pusey was guided throughout. Speaking of him many years afterwards, in the "History of my Religious Opinions," Newman says: "He was a man of large designs; he had a hopeful, sanguine mind; he had no fear

of others; he was haunted by no intellectual perplexities. People are apt to say that he was once nearer to the Catholic Church than he is now: I pray God that he may be one day far nearer to the Catholic Church than he was then; for I believe that in his reason and judgment, all the time that I knew him, he never was near to it at all. When I became a Catholic, I was often asked, 'What of Dr. Pusey?' When I said that I did not see symptoms of his doing as I had done, I was sometimes thought uncharitable. If confidence in his position is (as it is) a first essential in the leader of a party, this Dr. Pusey possessed pre-eminently."

But if all this be true, and it is not possible to doubt it, then by so much as it is better for the man, it is worse for the Church to which he belongs. He is not destitute either of historical knowledge or intellectual acuteness; and though unquestionably prepossessions colour his judgments, as they do those of most men, yet they hardly suffice to explain his unwavering belief in the agreement of his views with those of the Anglican Church, if that belief be altogether without foundation. It is certain, at least, that there have been others who have held substantially the same opinions. Gardiner was probably the first to entertain the conception of an Anglican Catholic Church, which, while repudiating the supremacy of Rome, should retain her doctrines and ceremonies; and had the course of events been propitious, he, instead of

being numbered among the persecutors, might have been one of the founders of an establishment which, unless the Erastian element in it had been an offence to Dr. Pusey, would have nearly corresponded to his ideal. Unfortunately for himself and for his master, Laud had the opportunity of embodying the vision which had flitted before Gardiner's eyes; and Dr. Pusey only follows in the steps of Laud and the bishops of the Restoration, by whom the Act of Uniformity was shaped and forced upon the country. The remarkable and melancholy feature of the case is, that Protestant England tolerates in this nineteenth century teachings and practices which in the seventeenth plunged the nation into civil war, and brought a king and a primate to the block,—not only tolerates them, but sees them rapidly attaining to supremacy without any effort to suppress them, except the passing of a Public Worship Act, which is nothing better than an impotent attempt to strangle a faith by cheapening the law.

If, in taking so advanced a position, and resolving to maintain it, Dr. Pusey has transgressed the law, the law (as he may fairly argue) might have dealt with him. He has not shrunk from the expression of his opinions, nor has he been measured in his mode of stating them. He has, indeed, on more than one occasion laid himself open to attack, and been visited with censure, and even punishment. But he has the satisfaction of seeing that his courage and endurance have secured decided ad-

vantages—advantages which, at one time, he could hardly have hoped to realise—for the principles he maintained. There is not one of the doctrines he has taught, even including those which he incurred penalties for teaching, which is not now proclaimed from hundreds of Anglican pulpits, and which may not be considered to have won for itself toleration, if nothing more. Baptismal regeneration—though, in truth, the key of the whole system in its relations to individual life—is now hardly disputed, there being but few even among Evangelicals who are not prepared to preach it in some mild and modified form. The Bennett judgment has established a precedent for a teaching in relation to the Real Presence which goes beyond that on which Dr. Pusey himself ventured in his earlier days; and yet Evangelicals have not seceded, and the country has not risen in protest against such serious tampering with one of the cardinal principles of Protestantism. Indeed, at the recent meeting of the Church Association in Liverpool, Bishop Alford (carrying out an idea expressed at the time that the Evangelicals should be grateful for a judgment which, represent it as they will, gives a legal sanction to the setting forth of rank Romanism by Anglican clergymen) declared that he was so satisfied with it that he did not wish to have a point altered. As to the "entire absolution of the penitent," Dr. Pusey's heart must be gladdened by the thought that not only is the doctrine tolerated, but practical effect is given to it by the

erection of numerous confessionals in churches which used to be regarded as distinctively Protestant. Supported by such facts, he may certainly be excused if he holds fast by the conviction that his is the true conception of the Anglican Church, and that of the Evangelicals an unwarranted heresy; and that it has been his noble mission to complete the work which the Caroline divines commenced, and to wipe off the reproach which, owing to the Protestant extravagance of Evangelicals, or the more criminal indifference of Latitudinarians, has so long rested upon his beloved Church.

The only legal way in which he can be deprived of this glorying is the condemnation of the system with which his name is identified; and, so far as present appearances indicate, that is one of the last things to be anticipated. The leader whose power is growing in the Establishment is undoubtedly Dr. Pusey. There is no other who could rally so large a following to his standard, or whose fiat would carry such weight. It is certainly singular if, after all, he is a disloyal member of the body in which he is so considerable a power. At all events, so long as he holds a Regius Professorship at Oxford, and remains undisturbed, even unmenaced, in the influence which this position gives him over the minds of the rising clergy, it is folly to talk of his doctrines as heresy, and himself as an arch-traitor. Appearances all tell a contrary tale; and if the other be the true view, it is high time that something were done

to prove it so. But a prosecution of Dr. Pusey is one of the last things contemplated, even by the Church Association. They would much rather fly at humbler game, forgetting how little they effect when they bring down a Ridsdale, or even a Mackonochie. So long as Dr. Pusey remains one of the foremost men in the Establishment, and the teaching which he gives at Oxford is stamped with all the authority the State can give, seeing that it proceeds from the chair of a Regius Professor or the pulpit of the University, it is idle to talk of the English Church as being Protestant. I do not write thus with any desire to see the venerable Canon of Christ Church made the victim of a prosecution, still less with any belief that so impolitic a step, if taken, could prove successful, but simply with the view of showing the weakness of the Evangelical position, and the need of some decided action being taken in some other way, if England is to be saved from the consequences of the teaching to which Dr. Pusey's life has been devoted. As things are, there is no man who has less reason, as he looks around, to distrust his own conviction as to the true position of the Anglican Church, or more ground for satisfaction with his life's work. He set himself early to prove that his Church was meant to be essentially "Catholic," or, to speak more correctly, mediæval; and the demonstration is so far complete, that he has lived to see a system of mediæval doctrine and ceremony introduced,

extensively practised, and, at least, indirectly legalised.

The Tractarian movement has been traced back by its own leaders as well as others to various sources, literary and political as well as theological and ecclesiastical. Dr. Newman speaks of Sir Walter Scott, Wordsworth, and Coleridge as having all, though in different senses, indirectly contributed to produce it. But waiving all speculation as to the influence of causes so remote as these, there are more proximate ones, about which there can be little question. Among these is to be placed, as one of the most powerful, the teaching of Dr. Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford. Most of the leading members of the school, Pusey, Newman, Oakeley, and I believe Froude, were among his pupils, and by him were taught to think and feel in a more "Catholic" spirit. He had himself been brought into contact with Roman Catholic priests, chiefly French emigrants, and had conceived an idea of them and their system very different from that which then obtained, even among the High Church party. Canon Oakeley, in his reminiscences of the movement, says: "Upon the subject of Church authority, episcopacy, the Apostolical Succession, and others with which the earlier Tracts were almost exclusively occupied, I do not remember to have derived any very definite ideas from Dr. Lloyd's teaching; but I do remember to have received from him an entirely new notion of Catholics and

Catholic doctrine." The Bishop himself fell a victim to his own friendly dispositions towards Rome. They led him, in opposition to the policy of all the High Churchmen of the day, to support Roman Catholic Emancipation, not only by his vote, but by a speech in which he sought to clear away what appeared to him Protestant misconceptions and prejudices. The result was that the King, that distinguished specimen of Erastian Protestantism, George IV., cut him at the levee, and his own clergy refused to dine with him. Excitement and mortification brought on fever, which ended his life in a few weeks. He died, little dreaming how his views had affected many of his pupils, some of whom were to carry them to a point which he neither contemplated nor desired.

In all probability the influence, whose results may probably have been a good deal exaggerated, would have passed away but for the character of the times telling powerfully upon a number of young men of high culture and taste, strong religious susceptibilities, and intense devotion to the Church, who became possessed with the idea that the world and the Church alike were going wrong, and that on them rested the duty of attempting to check the evils with which both were threatened. It seemed to them as though the very framework of society were being loosened by the successive encroachments of Liberalism. Roman Catholic Emancipation, followed by the Reform Bill and the triumph of the Whigs, who had dared to lay sacri-

legious hands upon the property of the Church, had awakened their serious alarm, and led them to undertake the daring task of erecting a breakwater against the flood of unbelief and Liberalism which to their anxious eyes seemed to be sweeping across the country.

Dr. Pusey had nothing to do with its initial stages. Palmer and Perceval seem to have been chiefly engaged in the organisation of a committee, and the work of securing the sympathy and assistance of the clergy in measures for the revival of Church principles, and resistance to the threatened reforms of the time. Newman tells us: "I, on the other hand, had out of my own head begun the Tracts; and these, as representing the antagonist principle of personality, were looked upon by Mr. Palmer's friends with considerable alarm." Then, as now, he was too strong, too independent, too fearless for his associates, and was in many respects strangely unfitted to be a champion of authority. The Tracts had already made some progress, when Dr. Pusey identified himself with the movement, and became a contributor to the series. Why he had held aloof previously does not appear. He had been more or less intimate with the members of this new party for some time, and undoubtedly shared their views, while it is quite certain that they would not only have hailed his co-operation, but would gladly have placed themselves under his lead. He had a higher University position than any of them had reached,

and, owing partly to his aristocratic connections, partly to his reputation both for learning and goodness, partly to his standing as a Professor and Canon, was a power in the University. Such a man might, without any reflection on his courage or his fidelity to his principles (in both of which points he is beyond the possibility of reproach), have reasonably hesitated to commit himself to a movement the full aim and result of which were not as yet very clear. Even so early as 1833, however, he was inclining towards it, and at the end of that year a Tract from his pen, on "Fasting," was issued in the series, and within a year afterwards he became one of its most zealous promoters, we might say its acknowledged chief. The tendency of Dr. Newman is perhaps to depreciate the importance of his own position, and we may, therefore, subtract a little from his strongly-coloured view of the value of Dr. Pusey's accession. Yet the fact that the movement which at first was called "Newmania," soon came to be familiarly designated by the name of his friend, would seem to indicate that he is not far wrong in saying: "There was henceforth a man who could be the head and centre of the zealous people in every part of the country who were adopting the new opinions; and not only so, but there was one who furnished the movement with a front to the world, and gained for it a recognition from other parties in the University."

How was it, it may be asked now, that Dr. Pusey should be regarded as so invaluable an accession,

and should so naturally take the lead of a party which already included Newman? The latter would now be generally pronounced the greater man of the two, with an intellect more penetrating, with a spirit more fearless and independent, and, what is of immense importance in all popular movements, with a greater power of captivating the imagination and winning the heart. Yet with all this, it is not wonderful that the relative positions which we from our knowledge of them might have expected them to take, were reversed, and Dr. Pusey became, what in fact he still remains, the recognised chief. English society, and even society in the Universities, is not wholly proof against the influences of birth, and Pusey belongs to the family of the Bouveries, and is the son of a half-brother of the then Earl of Radnor. That would of course have counted for nothing if there had not been something in the man himself to excite confidence and admiration; but, combined with high personal recommendations, it could not but tell in his favour. These he certainly had. Already he was known as a scholar of no ordinary attainments, and his pure and noble life, with its many acts of munificent charity, had secured him a reputation for piety not inferior to that which he had so justly won for learning. His religious character, indeed, caused him to be viewed even by the Evangelicals with an amount of favour which was not extended to any of his associates.

Greatly as they disliked his High Church opinions,

they could not but respect his personal goodness. He was, in truth, a novelty. Hitherto High Churchism had been cold and dry, if not something worse. But instead of the typical representatives of the school, men who hated all enthusiasm, and were diligent in their use of the world without particular care not to abuse it, who rode to hounds, and were more at home in the hunting-field or at the dining-table than in the pulpit, here was a man of undoubted zeal and great self-denial, who preached his High Church doctrines with as much earnestness and power as the most devoted Evangelical teacher, and, what was more, worked them out in daily life with consistency as unimpeachable. The phenomenon puzzled Low Churchmen, but impressed them also, and led them to distinguish between Dr. Pusey and others of the same school. Of course this only applied to a certain section of the more moderate Evangelicals, and even with them it only lasted for a time, until the antagonism between him and them became more pronounced and unmistakable. But for the time it affected a certain number. Some of them had been alarmed by the state of things in the Establishment, and liked the action of the Whig Government and many of its appointments quite as little as their High Church opponents, and were ready therefore, so far as was possible without compromise of their own principles, to unite in any reasonable plan of resistance. If men of this stamp did not at once rally to the standard of Dr. Pusey, his leadership cer-

tainly served to diminish the hostility with which they would otherwise have regarded the movement.

That he possesses in a very high degree some of the most essential qualities of a chief, no one who has marked the events of the last forty years can for a moment doubt. All who are acquainted with him testify to a singular loyalty and affectionateness of nature, which gives him a powerful hold upon his friends. Of his chivalry sufficient proofs have been given, in the boldness with which from time to time he has come forward in the defence of acts on the part of some of his followers which he had not advised, and which probably were contrary to his judgment. What is of equal if not even greater importance, he has always had a clear view of the position, and tenaciously held to it. In him there has been comparatively little development. He always protested against the usurpations of Rome, and he protests against them still. He has, from the first, taught the doctrines which Protestantism most abhors, and which are regarded as the most characteristic points of the Romish system, and he is doing no more now. He has always been a sturdy assertor of Church authority, and he is in his style and tone an incarnation of the authority he struggles to uphold. He does not seem to know a doubt himself, and he speaks with a confidence which would indicate that he expects his authoritative declarations of the opinions of the Fathers and the will of the Church to be accepted with the same unquestioning faith

which he himself accords alike to the voice of tradition and to the teachings of Scripture. This dogmatism offends some, but it is an invaluable power in a leader, especially the leader of a party which fights under the flag of authority.

There is a somewhat curious but very true reference to him in Father Newman's well-known story of "Loss and Gain." The speaker has been describing a commonplace Oxford tutor, who had given them some very wise directions, which were open only to this objection, that they were utterly pointless, such as, "Be true, be true, be good, be good, don't go too far, keep in the mean, have your eyes about you, eschew parties, follow our divines, all of them—all which was but putting salt on the bird's tail," an opinion in which Protestants would in the main agree, feeling at the same time that it needed only a little more distinctness to furnish a fitting rule for the development of a manly character. Even young men, if they are ever to be strong, must be left to exercise their independent judgment, and the real ground of complaint against the sort of namby-pamby counsel quoted above is that, in its desire to strike out the golden mean, it becomes altogether colourless and feeble. But the school which looked up to Dr. Pusey wanted not advice but direction, and he was their model. The speaker continues: "Dr. Pusey, on the other hand, is said to be always decisive. He says, 'This is Apostolic, that's in the Fathers; St. Cyprian says this, St. Augustine

denies that; this is safe, that's wrong; I bid you, I forbid you.' I understand all this; but I don't understand having duties put upon me which are too much for me. I don't understand, I dislike, having a will of my own, when I have not the means to use it justly. In such a case, to tell me to act of myself is like Pharaoh setting the Israelites to make bricks without straw. Setting me to inquire, to judge, to decide, forsooth! it's absurd; who has taught me?" No words could better describe the spirit of the party, or explain more clearly one of the great secrets of Dr. Pusey's success. Is Newman himself intended in the companion picture of Smith, "who never speaks decidedly on difficult questions," and of whom one of the speakers says, "The truth is, I suspect he is more of a sceptic at bottom"? It might perhaps shock the worthy Oratorian to be told that it would have been quite possible, under certain conditions, for him to have advanced as far in the direction of sceptical thought as his brother has done, yet it is nevertheless true. But no one would say the same thing of Dr. Pusey. He is a dogmatist by nature, and for himself it is fortunate that it is so, seeing he has to defend a position so compromising as the "Anglican solecism."

To some extent the Tractarian movement, of which he was thus the acknowledged chief, was aided by circumstances The times were propitious to the work, inasmuch as in the recoil from the triumphant Liberalism of the day, many were disposed to magnify the claims of the Church,

which they thought so rudely and violently handled. They were in the state of mind which Canon Ryle, when he is arguing that Disestablishment will not weaken the Church, predicts will be that of all earnest Episcopalians, should they ever find themselves deprived of the fostering care of the State. The attack on their Church only made them more devoted to her, and in their passionate and chivalrous zeal they were ready to adopt the most extreme views of her authority, and to follow those who sought to give them practical embodiment. How easily a sentiment of this kind is developed, how rapidly it grows, and how fierce it is apt to become; how every proposal of reform is regarded by it as a fresh insult, provoking and justifying a still more intense and reactionary opposition; how great the fascination it is sure to exert over young and ardent enthusiasts, and how powerful the impression which they, encouraging and stimulating each other, may make upon the world outside, it is not necessary to point out. In addressing themselves to a spirited class of men, smarting under defeat, and possessed by a wild and exaggerated alarm as to the evils with which they were threatened by such dangerous democrats as Earl Grey and Lord John Russell, the Tractarian leaders had much in their favour. They were, in truth, so far right in their mingled dislike and dread of Whiggery, that its ecclesiastical policy was a pure Erastianism, which is not less opposed to their idea of the Church than the most extreme form of voluntaryism; and they were

equally sound in their view that the only way of maintaining the political ascendency of the Establishment was to revive the spiritual authority of the Church. The success which they have achieved has itself been a prolific source of fresh danger, but it may be doubted whether the Establishment would have lasted so long if it had not been for the new force which they have added to the defence. Political influences have contributed to the result; but it is pretty certain that Toryism owes more to the Church than the Church does to Toryism, and what power the Church has exerted has been mainly due to the action of the so-called "Catholic" revival. But though it has really been the strength of the most Erastian of all Erastian institutions, it was conceived in a spirit of bitter hostility to Erastianism, especially as developed in the policy of the Whigs, who dared to meddle with bishoprics, curtail chapters, suppress canonries, and in every possible way to make the clergy feel their subordination to the State.

Still, while this feeling had prepared a great deal of combustible material, which was only waiting for the torch to kindle it into a fierce flame, any temporary conflagration would soon have been extinguished had there been no deeper and truer sentiment at work. But those who had set themselves to effect the deliverance of the Church were men of great power, both intellectual and spiritual. Little as they might suspect it, they had themselves felt the quickening and emancipating influence of a reforming age. Unhappily

it led them in a wrong direction, but it was a real power over them. In truth they wandered just as far from the accepted ideas and the ruling schools of the day as Dr. Arnold and those who sympathised with him. The one party were as much innovators as the other, though their innovations consisted in attempts at restoration. In these endeavours, however, they were as remarkable for the earnestness of their religious zeal, and for the devotion of their lives to Christian service, as for their subtlety of speculation and accuracy of learning. The rough, stern, defiant, we might almost say savage, temper of the party, especially where bishops or other Church dignitaries are to be resisted, is of later date. Little, if any, of it is to be found in the early Tractarians. Perhaps in reading their expressions relative to each other, we may sometimes suspect a little exaggeration, and wish that there was less to suggest the idea of a "mutual admiration" society; but even if something be deducted from the high estimate formed by them of each other, it cannot be questioned that many of them were men of very high calibre. It is only necessary to mention the names of Keble, so saintly in character and so humble in spirit; Hurrell Froude, who in his brief course seems to have inspired such enthusiasm by his brilliant qualities of mind and heart; and of John Henry Newman, towering so high in intellectual power and spiritual greatness that we can only look on him, and mourn that such a man should have been the victim of such a strange perversion

of judgment. Dr. Pusey is not unworthy to stand by his side, with learning not less profound, if with genius less brilliant; with piety equally sincere, though probably even narrower in its sympathies; as abject in his devotion to the Church (though his conception of the Church differs from that of his old friend), but quite as intent on fulfilling his own idea of loyalty to Christ. The effect which such men produced is thus described in a brief memoir just published of Arthur W. Haddan, one of the most accomplished scholars the Anglican Church could boast, who came under the spell of their influence. "The Oxford Society of those days," says his brother in the biography, "was thoroughly permeated with the 'Church' opinions, then fast rising into notice among the public generally. It is scarcely too much to say that, as each successive class-list came out, those who appeared in the highest places shared almost to a man the then prevalent feelings and doctrines of the place. Nor, considering the zeal, self-denial, and true unworldliness exhibited in the lives of those who were foremost in the 'movement,' is it at all wonderful that the younger part of the University were so much impressed as they were with the truth and importance of the principles held by them."

This view of Dr. Pusey and his coadjutors may seem strange to those who have been accustomed to hear them denounced as traitors, using their position in a Protestant Church to betray Pro-

testant interests. If such a charge could be fairly maintained against them, these eulogies upon them would properly be exchanged for severe condemnation. Moral integrity is a cardinal Christian virtue; and if it could be shown that it was wanting, neither amiability of spirit, nor simplicity of personal habits approaching to austerity, nor abundance of self-denying labours, could warrant a favourable verdict upon those in whose character there was so fatal a blot. The obliquity of vision which too many show on this point, and their readiness to gloss over the infidelity of individuals to obligations which they have voluntarily incurred, and by accepting which they have obtained ecclesiastical position, is one of the most melancholy features of the times. It is only in relation to the Church that it is found. Men are quick enough to see, and willing enough to punish, offences against righteousness elsewhere. It is only in reference to ecclesiastical subscription that this elasticity of conscience is not only tolerated, but justified. If it could be shown that Dr. Pusey was open to such an imputation, the estimate of his personal worth must be greatly reduced.

There are two ways of looking at this point of moral obligation, as affecting not only the Anglicans but all parties in the Establishment, each of which is to be equally deprecated. The one, by implication if not by express assertion, refuses to allow strict ethical principles to be applied to the case. A subscription to formularies, its advocates contend,

is to be regarded according to the view which the nation generally takes of it, and if the nation does not expect its terms to be literally construed, the individual has no occasion to trouble himself because his views would not abide the application of such a test. The theory is an extremely liberal and pleasant one for those who are able to accept it, and it may be urged in its favour that the latitude it claims must be conceded, unless the Establishment is to perish. Those who hold that it is more important to preserve the simplicity of conscience than the existence of the Establishment, may well hesitate before they give it their sanction.

The other extreme, however, is equally objectionable. It assumes a conscious dishonesty in all who give their assent to documents with some important parts of which they disagree. Nonconformists were at one time too prone to adopt this view, and there was this excuse for them, that they themselves obey the law which they apply to others. They have learned, however, that there may be acts of this kind which they cannot explain, but which it would be unjust as well as uncharitable to impute to moral obliquity. But the plea which may be urged in extenuation of any severity in the judgments of Dissenters, is not available for strong partisans within the Church itself, to whom may be applied the language of the Apostle: "Thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for those that judgest doest the same

things." It is hard to know whether indignation or contempt is the proper feeling to cherish towards a Churchman, himself an unbeliever in Baptismal Regeneration or the Athanasian Creed, who would involve in one sweeping condemnation Dr. Pusey and his followers as disloyal traitors to the Establishment. Whatever ardent partisans, who talk about purifying the Church by casting out the traitors, may think, it is certain that the country will not sustain them in their endeavours to secure a partial and one-sided application of the law for this purpose. Englishmen have strong Protestant feelings, but they have a love of justice also, and this is one of the great difficulties in the way of a legislation which would get rid of an evil that is fast becoming intolerable.

The complacency with which the Evangelicals assume that theirs is a Protestant Church is amusing until it causes them to impugn the honesty of men who, whether they be right or wrong, stoutly maintain the very opposite, and who are able, at all events, to adduce some very remarkable historic evidence in support of their views. So far as the question of Dr. Pusey's own honour is concerned, it is perhaps sufficient to say that he himself is absolutely unconscious of any disloyalty to the Church. It is hard to believe that there are not some points in the formularies, especially in the Articles, by which he and his school are staggered; but it is equally difficult to suppose that the quiet and confident

tone in which they speak conceals a secret distrust as to their own position. Some of their attempts at self-justification have often had too much the appearance of verbal quibbles or fine-spun sophistries. But it must never be forgotten that we and they look at them from entirely different points of view. With them the fact of the Apostolic Succession seems to swallow up everything else. They find it in the Anglican Church, which, therefore, they hold to be Catholic, and, as such, possessed of a right to their allegiance, which is not to be ignored because of small points of difference, and which, in truth, could not be set aside without their incurring the guilt of schism. Of course, when such feelings are predominant, these points themselves will be treated in a much more tender and accommodating manner than would be employed by those who looked at them as mere abstract propositions. The fear of causing a breach in the "Catholic Church," or of separating themselves from its communion, will naturally dispose them to listen to any suggested interpretation which may relieve them from any difficulties by which they are troubled. They will be all the more disposed to welcome such ideas—perhaps unconsciously to put some strain upon their consciences in order to adopt them—because they find in the Church men of other schools, who, as they judge, and correctly judge, are much farther removed from the true ideal than they are themselves. This was the point raised by Mr. W.

G. Ward in his celebrated defence before the Convocation, which was a great deal more than a mere *tu quoque* addressed to the other parties in the Establishment. That was the form which it assumed, and to the superficial reader it might seem to be nothing more. But it was really an impeachment of the formularies, and of the law by which they were enforced, rather than of those who were forced to put a "non-natural" sense upon some one or other of them. The underlying thought was that the documents were so inconsistent with themselves that no one could *ex animo* accept them all, and that least of all was the school to be condemned which insisted on the "Catholic" rights of the Church, and sought to uphold them.

Looking at these points in the spirit of candour and charity, it is not hard to understand how a theologian with the prepossessions of Dr. Pusey may, without any infidelity to conscience, have employed or endorsed the reasonings in the "Tracts for the Times." But this does not affect the essential character of the reasonings themselves, nor diminish their injurious influence upon the public mind. The writers, indeed, may say in their own defence that the positions which they took, and by taking which they excited such a fierce outcry, are now accepted. Tract XC., in which these teachings reached their culminating point, provoked the condemnation of the University, and led to the retirement of its author from the Anglican Church; but its principles are so far

triumphant that numbers of clergymen inculcate the most obnoxious of the doctrines, whose right to a place in the Establishment it asserted, and enjoy perfect immunity. That the effect on the popular mind has been demoralising in the highest degree cannot be questioned. The popular conception of the real position of the Church was possibly erroneous, and, if so, it is well that it should be rectified. But as yet no such result has been attained, and casuists, who sit in their studies and spin their ingenious theories, sustaining them by their antiquarian lore, which seems to common minds as though it could be manipulated so as to prove anything, have little conception of the shock they cause to consciences which have not been trained in their dialectics. It is useless, however, to reproach Dr. Pusey, or to denounce the sophistry of his school, so long as they are allowed to remain undisturbed in the Establishment. There is, indeed, the difficulty which they, as believers in the Catholic Church, may be expected to feel in continuing in a body distinctly repudiating the authority they hold to be supreme, and insisting on absolute obedience to the State even in religious matters, and which, if it promulgates certain "Catholic" doctrines, does so not because they are Catholic, but because they are sanctioned by the State; which to some of those truths they hold most precious concedes nothing but a bare tolerance, if so much, and which, at the same time, allows their principles to be condemned and denounced by a large

proportion of the clergy. On his own theory, Dr. Pusey must repudiate mere toleration for himself, nay, must refuse it to other schools who are trampling upon what he esteems most sacred, and especially must detest the rule which enforces on him an outward fellowship with these rebels against Church authority as a shameless usurpation. Still he upholds the Establishment, which; in truth, when stripped of that unreal and delusive halo with which Dean Stanley and other such dreamers seek to surround it, and looked at in its real character, presents an aspect sufficiently depressing to all who believe that truth and righteousness are more precious and more likely to advance the cause of Christ than any great organisation whatever. "Catholics" insist that an Establishment is theirs which not only includes the Protestantism—or, as they would call it, the Puritanism—which they hate, but is based on a principle in direct contradiction of that which they maintain. Evangelicals, on the other hand, proclaim that an Establishment whose influence is largely wielded by men who avow their desire to correct the excesses of the Reformation, is the one certain and unfailing defence of Protestantism. And to complicate the difficulty, Broad Churchmen come forward and invite us to admire the comprehensiveness of a Church, resting on an Act of Uniformity, in which both parties enjoy perfect liberty to dwell together in hatred and contention. Charity constrains us to believe that all are sincere in their views,

but the documents which admit of such contradictory interpretations must surely be somewhat remarkable in their construction. It is high time that some authoritative decision was given between them; but were it done, the days of the Establishment would be numbered. The world knows this, and has little respect for those who, rather than face such an issue, connive at the unreality of the present state of things. It is a continual puzzle how men with views so definite as the "Catholic" leaders, can be parties to an arrangement whose very toleration of them is in contempt of their fundamental principles.

Dr. Pusey has clearly defined his own ecclesiastical position, and if it is not understood by many Protestants, it is because they find it hard to reconcile antagonism to Rome with the acceptance of the doctrines and rules which they have been accustomed to regard as the essence of the Romish system. They have thus been led to form an erroneous judgment of Dr. Pusey, as, from the same cause, acting in an opposite direction, they have misconceived the position of the Old Catholics and Dr. Dollinger. Between these two there is a very close approximation, but in each that which separates him from his co-religionists necessarily becomes most prominent. Dr. Dollinger, in taking up a hostile attitude towards Rome, is known most by that and by the opposition to the Papal usurpation which lies at the root of it. Dr. Pusey, in seeking to give a more "Catholic" character to his

own Church, emphasises chiefly the doctrines which, in his judgment, have been improperly neglected, and which are those that Englishmen esteem distinctively Romish. Hence the same people, if taking a cursory view of the situation only, applaud the one and condemn the other. It may be said that there is, at least, this reason for judging so differently men who occupy ground so similar, that with the one it is a position in advance, with the other one in retreat. But the true explanation is, that attention in both cases has been directed mainly to the points in which there is, or seems to have been, change. Dr. Pusey's opposition to the Papacy, and especially to its latest developments, both in discipline and doctrine, has been overlooked in view of his wide departure from the traditional ideas of Protestantism. The concessions he has made seem so grave and serious that Protestants have taken little account of that for which he is still prepared to make desperate fight. There are not many Englishmen who can at once grasp the subtle suggestion, so dear to High Churchmen, that the best way of resisting the pretensions of Rome is to oppose to her a Church equally claiming to be Catholic, and prepared to support her right. A more shrewd and true instinct teaches them that in every conflict of this kind Rome is sure to be victorious, that the best way of escaping the Pope is to get rid of the priest, and that the only method of arresting the encroachments of authority is to maintain the absolute right

of the individual conscience. The prophets of High Churchism will have to charm wisely before they can dispossess the popular mind of this conception, and while it exists Dr. Pusey is sure to be classed among the favourers of Rome.

It must be remembered, however, in all fairness, that he has never swerved from the path he originally marked out for himself, and that he maintains now, as he has done throughout, that he has been loyal to his own Church and a consistent opponent of Rome. In the preface to his treatise on the Real Presence, in 1857, he says: "Formerly I have not thought it necessary to vindicate the consistency of my belief with the formularies of the Church of England, because it never seemed to me that it needed vindication. I took, and do take, every letter of our formularies in what I believed, and do now believe, to be their simple and grammatical sense." What remains to be said after such a declaration, whose absolute truthfulness it is impossible to suspect? It was for those who believe that his teachings are nevertheless Romish, to show that they did not correspond with the formularies, interpreted in their "simple and grammatical sense." To us, concerned chiefly for the vindication of Protestantism, it is a serious thing that this has not even been attempted, for there are but few points in which his doctrine is to be distinguished from that of Rome. In his celebrated "Eirenicon"—his work on the "Truth and Office of the English Church"—he finds a pleasure in enumerating the

many doctrines which the two Churches hold in common, and in showing how little needs to be done in order to effect the reunion for which he sighs. After speaking of some of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel in which, for the most part, they are at one, not only with each other, but with all Evangelical Protestants, he says: "We use the self-same prayers in Baptism, *and thank God, in the same words, that He has been pleased to regenerate our children therein.* We both confess one Baptism for 'the remission of sins.' After confession, the Church directs the self-same words to be used in absolving from sin; and we have pointed out, again and again, how the Church of England, while teaching (as the Fathers often do) that Baptism and the Holy Eucharist have a special dignity, symbolised by the water and the blood which flowed from our Redeemer's side, is careful not to exclude other appointments of God from being in some way sacraments, as channels of grace, or (in the old definition of sacraments) visible signs of an invisible grace. This is, indeed, inseparable from the idea of confirmation, orders, absolution, marriage." Even on extreme unction he contends that the objection is only to the abuse; and as to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, says: "A sacramental or a hyper-physical change, no English Churchman, who believes the Real Presence as his Church teaches, could hesitate to accept." In all this, however, he recognises the claim of the Pope to supremacy (and that prior to the Vatican

Council and the decree of infallibility) and the Mariolatry of the Romish Church, as serious barriers to union. The blame he would of course ascribe to Rome, which, according to him, has in these and some other points forsaken true, primitive, and Catholic tradition; but he hopes—we should rather say hoped ten years ago, for by this time the Ultramontane development must have extinguished the last vestige of such an expectation—that "a liberty which individuals could not use, and explanations which, so long as they remain individual, must be unauthoritative, might be formally made by the Church of Rome to the Church of England as the basis of reunion."

The opposition to Rome of a divine holding such views as these will not count for much with any true Protestant. We will not say that it is the mere accident of birth or training which has made Dr. Pusey an Anglican rather than a Romanist, but it is at least evident that that exercise of private judgment which is so dear to Protestants, is to him altogether abhorrent. "I cannot imagine," he says, "how any faith could stand the shock of leaving one system, criticising it, and, casting himself into another system, criticising it." He is at Oxford, and a Regius Professor there, while John Henry Newman is a priest of the Oratory, neglected by the Church on which he has shed so much lustre, in consequence of taking the independent course which to his quondam ally seems so incompatible with the maintenance of any faith at all. Their positions

ought to have been reversed, for there is more of the Protestant temper in the man who has boldly forsaken a community with which he was no longer in harmony, than in him whose principle of submission is so strong, that he resolves to abide in the Church in which he was educated. The Romish Curia, in its treatment of Newman, shows that it has formed much the same estimate. There is a mind far more adapted to its purposes in one who can say: "For myself I have always felt that had (what God of His mercy avert hereafter also) the English Church, by accepting heresy, driven me out of it, I could have gone in no other way than that of closing my eyes and accepting whatever was put before me." * Surely this is the very stuff out of which Romanists are made, and the only influence which a man of type can exert in the Anglican Church is to inculcate those principles of authority which would prepare her for submission to Rome. The very thought of such an event is ridiculed by the unthinking multitude to-day, but it is much less improbable that the steps which still remain before such a consummation be reached will be taken, than it was twenty years ago that the advance already made would be secured. They are foolish, indeed, who are misled by the appearances of hostility between the two parties at present. Rome is a master of tactics, and knows when to browbeat and when to conciliate. Should it ever appear

* "Truth and Office of the English Church," p. 98.

to her that the latter policy is the wisest, she will not hesitate to adopt it, in order to accelerate the conquest on which her heart is set. If, alas, that day should ever arrive, and England be once more laid prostrate at the feet of Rome, no man who has yet taken part in the conflict will have done more to bring about that terrible calamity than the Regius Professor of Hebrew. The secession of Newman, Faber, and Manning combined, has not wrought, and is not working, such mischief to Anglican Protestantism as results from the continuance of Dr. Pusey as one of her principal teachers of Divinity.

There are two or three points particularly in which he has rendered great service to Rome. Not the least of these is the share he has taken in breaking down, or at all events materially weakening, the hostile sentiment with which she used to be regarded even in High Church circles. Others of the party—Mr. Hurrell Froude and Dr. Ward in its earlier days, Mr. Blunt and Dr. Littledale in more recent times—laboured towards the same end by depreciating the Reformation and its authors. Mr. Keble and Dr. Pusey have desired rather to present the more favourable side of Rome. "Speak gently of our sister's fall," says the former, and the words indicate the spirit in which Rome was invariably treated. Indeed, Dr. Pusey, in endeavouring to refute the charge brought against the "Tracts for the Times" that their tendencies were Romish, cites these lines from the "Lyra Apostolica":—

> "Oh that thy creed were sound,
> For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,
> By thy unwearied watch and varied round
> Of service in thy Saviour's holy name."

With such a quotation adduced to show the absence of a Romanising spirit, it is not surprising certainly that the impression went abroad that there was a strong sympathy with the old system; and the impression was perfectly correct. Very strongly does the feeling come out in the letter—eloquent, tender, and in some respects deeply touching—which Dr. Pusey wrote relative to the secession of Newman. To him that event must have been a very heavy blow, not merely because of its personal but still more because of its ecclesiastical relations—a triumph to opponents who had always prophesied such an issue, and a serious interruption to the great work of revolutionising the Church in which he and his friends were engaged. But in writing of it, so far from any word of reproach, the idea of the letter is that Anglicanism has lost her illustrious son because of her own sins and shortcomings; Rome has won him through the greater faith and purer devotion of her children. "The first pang came to me years ago when I had no other fear, but heard that he was prayed for by name in so many churches and religious houses on the Continent. . . And now must they not think that their prayers, which they have offered so long—at times, I think, night and day, or at the Holy Eucharist—have been heard? And may we not

have forfeited him because there was comparatively so little love and prayer?" While, too, the secession is deplored as the "intensest loss" Anglicanism could have had, there is the expression of a conviction that the English Church had not known how to employ so "great an instrument of God," but had left "a sharp sword lying in its scabbard, or hung up in the sanctuary, because there was no one to employ it. God had taken it, and put it into hands where it would be used to greater advantage." The event has shown that the sword, however willing to yield itself to skilful handling, was too sharp for any priestly organisation to use with safety. It is clear, however, that Dr. Pusey thinks it of secondary importance whether it is drawn for England or for Rome. "He seems then," he says, varying the figures, "not so much gone from us as transplanted into another part of the vineyard, where the full energies of his powerful mind can be employed, which here they were not." He who could write thus ought, it appears to us, to have taken the same path as his friend. He could hardly have used words more fitted to encourage others to follow so illustrious an example; and it would have been a happy thing for the Establishment if all who cherished such sympathies had adopted such a course. As it is, the State Church contains numbers of them, and yet Evangelicals trust in it as a breakwater against Popery. How long is so transparent an imposture to be tolerated?

Dr. Pusey has further helped Rome by encouraging the practice of Confession. His action on this point laid him open to a remarkable appeal, which he construed into an attack, from three of the most distinguished members of his party, Messrs. Maskell, Allies, and Dodsworth, all of whom seceded to the Romish Church immediately afterwards. Their question was one which might very naturally suggest itself to men who were not indifferent to logic or deaf to the voice of conscience, who found themselves in a Church in which, as they held, they were involved in contradictory obligations, bound as priests to receive confession, and yet in submission to bishops "who have to render account to God for the priests" as well as for the other members of the flock, and who, so far from being willing to give them a commission as confessors, were distinctly opposed to the exercise of such a function. "What authority," they asked, "is there for supposing that the acts of a priest are valid, who hears confessions and gives absolution by mere virtue of his order, without ordinary or delegated jurisdiction from his bishop?" The inquiry was, no doubt, a very awkward one for Dr. Pusey, inasmuch as it goes directly to the root of Anglican difficulties. It was perfectly reasonable, however, that it should be addressed to him, since, as Mr. Dodsworth, one of the querists, says, he "was one of the foremost to recommend the restoration of this salutary practice, both by precept and example. He was the first Anglican

clergyman who spoke to me of its revival in the Established Church; and I know of many persons whom he has led into the practice." Still the Doctor did not like to be thus interrogated, and refused to commit himself by a categorical answer. It was his *rôle* rather to abide in his calling, and gradually to assimilate Anglicanism to Romanism, without troubling himself to explain difficulties or remove anomalies. He would put his own sense on the formularies, and in this way be a law unto himself, determining the sense, as he says, "where it is ambiguous, by the faith of the whole Church, before East and West were divided." There is here sufficient latitude; and yet it is a matter of doubt whether even thus he could find a sanction for the practice which so troubled the minds of his friends, whose logical consistency led them to Rome.

Dr. Pusey had the courage of his convictions, also, in his assertion of the doctrine of the Real Presence. He, in a sermon preached in Christ Church, Oxford, was so extreme, so liable to be confounded with the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, in fact, so hard to distinguish from it, that it led to proceedings against him by the Heads of Houses, and his suspension from preaching before the University for two years. The adverse action was characterised by all that weakness, that blindness of passion, that contempt even for the outward show of justice by which their opponents have so often played into the hands of the Tractarian school. Indecent haste, im-

proper secrecy, distinct refusal to give the accused the grounds of the objections to his teaching, and a sentence which, if the allegations could be sustained, was miserably inadequate to the offence, were among the objectionable points in this discreditable transaction, from which Dr. Pusey alone was ultimately the gainer. Distinct reason should certainly have been given for the censure; and if there had really been such a transgression of the law as was implied, proceedings of a different character ought to have been taken. As it was, the whole thing appeared an utter mockery—the forerunner of many others which were to follow in the struggle—when, at the close of the brief period of suspension, Dr. Pusey appeared in the same pulpit, and, without a word of explanation or apology, proceeded to give a sequel to his former discourse. Twenty-five years afterwards, Mr. Bennett could assert that the doctrine of the sermon was received without question; and when he preached it himself in a still more offensive form, escaped the condemnation of the courts of law. So the Church moves on; and yet there are those who close their eyes to all these signs of advance Romewards, and believe, with an obstinacy which nothing can shake, that to-morrow will be as this day, and the Establishment continue to be the home of the great historic schools of thought, one of which shall proclaim Rome to be Antichrist, while the other, with Dr. Pusey, shall teach that "the Roman Church and ourselves are kept apart

much more by that vast practical system *which lies beyond the letter of the Council of Trent, things which are taught with a quasi-authority in the Roman Church, than by what is actually defined.*"

To myself, one of the most surprising features in the history of Dr. Pusey is, that the Evangelicals have on more than one occasion accepted him as an ally. He was one of the most active against the Essayists and Reviewers, and against Dr. Colenso; and they were content to receive his aid, forgetting that between them there was really no common principle, and failing to perceive that they were, by the very act of association, helping a cause which could hardly be less offensive in their eyes than Rationalism itself. A little more keenness of vision might have enabled them to perceive that from the negations of unbelief there was nothing to fear; whereas the force of superstition was one of the strongest and most perilous against which they could have to contend, especially since there was so much in the Church's formularies which readily lent itself to its purposes, and that the victory over a freedom which had been too daring, won by the help of the champions of authority, must contribute only to strengthen their dangerous allies. That this was the case can hardly be questioned. Dr. Pusey himself profited largely, so far as winning the favour of Evangelical Protestants is concerned, by the conflicts in which he played so distinguished a part. If, indeed, any had been insensible before to the

character and power of the man, or to the learning of the divine, it was well they should be freed from the influence of the prejudice which had blinded or misled them. But it is not well that any should forget that all the saintliness of his life, all the authority of his scholarship, all the charm of his personal influence, all the force of his teaching, has been employed on behalf of a system which is essentially Romish. "Dr. Pusey," said the Rev. W. Palmer, in a letter to the Bishop of London, written more than thirty years ago, "holding the position of a recognised leader of a section of the Church of England, has at length openly, avowedly, and authoritatively maintained the propriety of introducing Romish devotion, of using images and crucifixes, and offering to them the signs of worship customary in the Church of Rome; of employing rosaries, devotions to the 'five wounds,' multiplied repetitions of the Pater Noster, besides inculcating such hints as 'counsels of perfection,' and other doctrines, in his letter carried to the verge of orthodoxy, or beyond it; and Dr. Pusey has publicly denied that the Church of England has any 'distinctive doctrine,' and that 'it is idle' for any of her members to make declaration against Romish error and idolatry." The greater the personal work of such a teacher, the more perilous his influence in the Establishment. The fact is, he has gone far to work a revolution in it already. What the final issue will be is one of the problems of the future. If the Protestantism of the Evangelicals were worth the name, it would have been decided long ere this.

THE BISHOP OF EXETER.

IF it were possible for ardent Churchmen so far to divest themselves of the partisan spirit as to look at the facts connected with their favourite institution in their true character, and not as their prejudices represent them, the story of Dr. Temple, of the school he has left, and of the diocese to which he has succeeded, might itself disturb their confidence in the perfection of their system. The tale, with the comments of the press from time to time upon it, reads like a covert satire upon an Establishment among whose chief advantages, as set forth by one of its most recent defenders, are the guarantees it furnishes for "stability of doctrine" and "mutual tolerance." It is not necessary at present to refer to the admirable illustrations of the latter supplied by the storm which gathered round Dr. Temple, and the Ministry which appointed him, at the time of his elevation to the episcopate, and by the attempt of the Rugby trustees to put a ban upon certain opinions by passing over men of higher literary quali-

fications by whom they were held, and appointing to a scholastic position of the highest importance one of inferior attainments but of approved orthodoxy, all being alike clergymen of the same Church. It is the "stability of doctrine" in which the Church rejoices, on which there is so remarkable a commentary in the statement that the traditions of Exeter were broken by the appointment of Dr. Temple, and those of Rugby by that of Dr. Hayman. The idea is a suggestive one. It really means that in each case, though the several occupants of these offices belonged to a Church whose unity and orthodoxy are supposed to create so marked a distinction between it and dissenting communities, yet these changes involved in the case both of the diocese and the school an entire revolution in the religious and ecclesiastical influences of the place. The difference, be it remembered, is not one of individual character and temperament such as must be expected to occur everywhere, but of principle and system. Dr. Hayman, it is asserted by his defenders, was preferred to some of his competitors because he was a "sound Churchman," and the one point on which the majority might be said to have made up their minds, after the fashion of Alderman 'Cute, was to put everything that savoured of Liberalism down, and at all costs to secure a "sound Churchman;" the determination thus formed having an unconcealed reference to the evils of the former *régime* and an insinuation that the late Headmaster did not answer to the character. Whether

"sound Churchman" or not, Dr. Temple had been chosen as one of the chief rulers of the Church, and all the discontent of the clergy was unable to interfere with the appointment. It is certainly an awkward position in which those trustees have placed themselves, according to the statements of one of their own number, for if they be right, we have a bishop who is not a sound Churchman, and the evil tendencies which they have endeavoured—though hardly with the success they might have expected and desired—to counteract in the school at Rugby, have only found a wider field for their development in an important western see.

It is not easy to discover from the Erastian defenders of the Church whether it is a desirable thing or otherwise that these interruptions in the "traditions" of a diocese, or parish, or school, should occur. Probably, so far as the individual case is concerned, it would be said that it was a very good thing that the old *régime* of Dr. Philpotts was followed by one of an entirely different spirit and type; but a very bad thing that the progressive and liberal tone which Rugby has maintained since the days of Dr. Arnold, should be narrowed by Conservative influences. But it is not possible to play fast and loose with a principle in this fashion. If it is good that these revolutions (for they are nothing else) should occur, all parties must be content to accept them, whether they tell in their favour or not; for it is idle to suppose that one section will be content to take all the kicks, while

the other gets all the halfpence. For the "Liberal" or Broad Church party to rejoice in the succession of their representative to so decided an Anglican as Dr. Philpotts, and yet to cavil at the appointment of a Conservative or Reactionary to follow Dr. Temple at Rugby, is, to say the least, extremely inconsistent; and numbers of impartial men who condemn the action of the trustees in the appointment, feel that the spirit of resistance with which it was met was unreasonable. What would have been said if all the High Church clergy of the west had refused to show respect to their new diocesan, had taken every opportunity of thwarting his plans, and had even gone so far as openly to insult him? It may be said with truth (as will be apparent in the course of this sketch afterwards) that the Bishop has not at all fulfilled the evil anticipations that had been formed of him; that Frederick of Exeter is a very different man from Dr. Temple of Rugby, and that the desire of conciliation, and the tact requisite to accomplish it, have been as marked in him as in Dr. Hayman they have been conspicuous by their absence. But even so, Dr. Temple, with his antecedents and his known opinions, could not be acceptable to those who had been accustomed to look up to his predecessor with affection and deference, and they might have shown him the same distrustful and rebellious temper as the assistant-masters of Rugby have displayed. Had they done so, we should not have judged them severely, any more than we are disposed to think

hardly of the Rugby masters, for we can understand how, with the opinions held by them respectively, the position of both must be extremely irritating. It is, however, a result of the system to which they both profess allegiance, and it must, at all events, be expected to press equally upon all schools.

Were it to be ruled that it is desirable to preserve the traditions of dioceses unbroken, it might in course of time happen that England would be virtually partitioned into two or three distinct Churches, while yet there was but one Establishment. It is certainly an awkward and embarrassing position when a Temple succeeds a Philpotts, or a Wilberforce follows a Sumner; but unless there be these changes, one diocese might become the home of semi-Romanism, while another was the preserve of the most advanced form of Protestantism. Taking all bodies of Evangelical Nonconformists together, it would not be easy to find three men who, in doctrinal opinions and ecclesiastical sympathies, are further removed from each other than the Bishops of Durham, Exeter, and Lincoln; and if it was to be accepted as a principle that the traditions of each see should be maintained, there would be an ever-increasing divergence between the different portions of the same Catholic Church. It may be a matter of curious speculation whether the Establishment would gain or lose by the adoption of the principle. We are concerned only to notice the remarkable aspect in which the whole thing

presents the institution. When such revolutions occur in prominent cases—in a bishopric, for instance, or a great public school—they attract general attention; but they are continually going on in less noticed spheres, and hundreds and thousands of thinking men are passed over, as in the natural course of things, from a clergyman who has taught them to accept certain principles as of divine authority to another whose great business is to lead them to reject all that they have hitherto accepted, and to preach all that they have been accustomed to despise.

Certainly among all the changes which could have occurred in the spirit and character of an administration, it would not be easy to conceive of one more violent and abrupt than that from Dr. Philpotts to Dr. Temple. The former was an embodiment of the spirit of reaction; the latter is as marked a representative of the progressive and liberal tendencies of the time as the Church possesses, at all events among men of the class from which bishops are taken. The one was a well-known champion of authority in the strongest form which a so-called Protestant Church could bear, the other equally decided in his advocacy of liberty. For some years prior to his death Dr. Philpotts had been compelled to live in comparative quietude, but there was no change in his spirit nor modification of his views. To the end he was the firm assertor of priestly rights and sacramental efficacy. His celebrated controversies, his initiation of the

series of ecclesiastical prosecutions by the attempt to eject Mr. Gorham, his persecution (for it was little better) of Mr. Shore, his endless strifes with Mr. Latimer, the Exeter journalist, who was so keen a thorn in his side, belonged to an earlier period; but if his advanced years were sufficient to restrain the vigour by which once his administration had been distinguished, there is no evidence that they had caused any change in his principles or policy. We have not had for a long time a prelate who had more of the spirit of Hildebrand. The late Bishop of Winchester was equally strong in his ecclesiastical views, and equally desirous to maintain the authority of his Church and order, but he had more worldly wisdom and more geniality of temper. Dr. Hamilton, of Salisbury, was even more decided in his tendencies to Romish doctrine; but, taken altogether, Dr. Philpotts was the strongest and most uncompromising representative of Anglican sacerdotalism that has been seen on the Episcopal Bench since the days of the Nonjurors.

It is hardly possible to imagine a greater contrast to this despotic priest than was presented by the Head-master of Rugby. He was identified closely with the party which Dr. Philpotts hated—the advocate of principles which the High Church Bishop had opposed with all his might—the promoter of movements, ecclesiastical and political, which he regarded as dangerous alike to Church and State. If it had been resolved to destroy the traditions of Exeter, it could not have been done

more effectually. Dr. Temple was not merely a schoolmaster with those liberal ideas on theological and ecclesiastical matters which are common in the highly-cultured class from which successful heads of public schools are taken, but he was an active Liberal politician, whose bold and fearless conduct on public questions had been an offence to a large number of the trustees by whom the school was governed. They did not venture to interfere with him, for his administration had been too successful, and he himself was too generally popular, to make such action safe; but that a clergyman filling such a position should be an active worker for the Liberal party, should give the weight of his speech and influence in opposition to the Tory squiredom of Warwickshire, and should even avow himself in favour of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, was not the less annoying to them because they were compelled to endure it in silence. That his appointment should be resented by them, in common with the whole Tory party, by High Churchmen everywhere, and, for other reasons, by a large number of excellent Churchmen who cared little about Dr. Temple's politics and were in sympathy with his anti-sacerdotal tendencies, was certainly not wonderful. In truth, the shock must have been so severe that we can make great allowance for the endeavour to find some compensation by that attempt to reverse the traditions of Rugby which has been attended with such disastrous consequences.

The promotion of Dr. Temple was certainly, to

all appearance, an extremely daring one, and one which was hardly to have been expected from Mr. Gladstone, who does not allow even political service to atone for theological disqualification. The motive of the late Prime Minister's episcopal appointments need not be discussed here. It has often been said that they were made with the view of strengthening the High Church party on the Bench. However this may have been, it is certain that, with one or two exceptions, his bishops were taken from that school. Dr. Temple's Broad Church sympathies might therefore have been expected to be a fatal bar to his promotion, but Mr. Gladstone estimated the character of Broad Churchism much more truly than those who take such a view. A strong Evangelical of the temper of Dr. Baring may be an object of dread, though it is amazing what an elevating influence ecclesiastical promotion will exert upon most men even of this party, however decided their views. A canonry has a considerable effect, as may be seen in the friendly attitude of Dr. Miller to Canon Gregory and his friends; a deanery is still more powerful in its influence; but a bishopric is all but irresistible. The rights of the priesthood and the hierarchy wear a very different appearance, as they are contemplated from the throne of a cathedral and the pulpit of an evangelical chapel, whose hearers have not yet unlearned the distinctive principles of Protestantism; and it is not surprising if the Bishop of Ripon, for example, takes rather "higher"

views than used to commend themselves to Dr. Bickersteth. It is to be feared there are not many Evangelicals who might not be safely trusted to show great tenderness and consideration to all High Churchmen, except the most advanced section of Ritualists, if they were invested with episcopal rule over them. There might, however, be more difficulty with them than with Broad Churchmen, most of whom have at bottom a tolerably strong ecclesiastical sentiment. At all events, if Mr. Gladstone reasoned thus, the event has justified his sagacity. He has appointed two Broad Churchmen —Dr. Fraser and Dr. Temple; but they are not the less decided in their Church principles, and sometimes assert them as strongly as any of their brethren.

But this was the last idea that would have occurred to most minds when Dr. Temple's nomination was announced. A more unpopular appointment, so far as the clergy and the strong adherents of the Church were concerned, could hardly have been made, unless Mr. Gladstone had selected some divine still more deeply committed, such as the Master of Balliol. Dr. Temple, indeed, had achieved a reputation as a teacher unrivalled since the days of Dr. Arnold, and almost challenging competition with his. So great was it that even the Liberal atmosphere of the place, which became still more fresh and vigorous under his influence, did not prevent Tory parents from putting their sons under his care. I have often talked with

a father whose hue of Toryism was the deepest it was ever my fortune to encounter, and whose hatred to Liberal ideas was of the nature of a passionate fanaticism, who, notwithstanding, placed his son at Rugby, and himself felt something of the indirect power of a teacher to whose principles he was bitterly opposed. No one can wonder at Dr. Temple's success after reading his sermons to the boys. The breadth of their sympathies, the directness of their thinking, the manliness of their tone, their full appreciation of the difficulties of schoolboys and anxious desire to meet them, and the simple elegance of their diction, would all serve to attract youthful hearers. Of theology there is little or none; but there is a wonderful power of bringing out the beauty of Scripture, and of investing old and familiar truths with the charm of freshness. They reveal a man of high culture, intent on filling his place efficiently, seeking to be the friend, helper, and counsellor of his boys; and while there is a lack of much one would desire to have had, they help us better to understand the success of the preacher in his daily work. But, apart from his work in the school, Dr. Temple's course had been, it is unnecessary to say, such as to draw upon him considerable odium, especially among those who are not able to discriminate, and who, having heard that the "Essays and Reviews" was a very bad book, and that he was one of the authors, at once put him down as an advanced Rationalist, if not an actual infidel. His connection with that notorious

volume was, indeed, the best-known fact in his history prior to his elevation to the Bench, and it was the real or ostensible cause of the fierceness with which it was opposed. Many, no doubt, felt aggrieved on religious grounds by the appointment; and others, who were unwilling to base their opposition on the political—which was the real—reason, were glad enough to conceal this feeling behind a professed zeal for orthodoxy.

Dr. Temple's connection with the "Essays and Reviews" was certainly remarkable. His own essay was a mere speculation, not distinguished by any profundity or brilliancy, and would have provoked little comment had it stood alone. It was only as the introductory essay in a volume which seemed intended to try to what extent the singularly elastic line of comprehension in the Anglican Church might be stretched, that it was at all noteworthy. It is true that each writer distinctly guarded himself from any responsibility for the opinions advocated by his associates; but whatever importance may attach to such a disclaimer, it is certain that it produced but little effect upon the popular mind. If a man writes an essay in a volume which advocates a much freer mode of dealing with Holy Scripture than is common in religious circles, which insists that there is in it a dark crust of human passion and infirmity, and which tramples under foot certain doctrines which are generally regarded as part of the orthodox theology, he must not be surprised if Christian people,

not all of them intelligent though extremely earnest, ascribe to the book a much worse character than it fairly deserves, and regard him as an accomplice in all its evil. He may say that none of the objectionable statements are found in his particular essay, and that he was not acquainted with the contents of the others, but the fact is there, that his name is in the company, and that it has given a sanction and certain measure of authority to the rest. There has been a good deal said in condemnation of the uncharitable and sweeping judgments which, under the excitement of panic, were passed upon the celebrated company who received at the time the damnatory *sobriquet* of the *Septem contra Christum*. But there is unquestionably a good deal to be said on the other side. No doubt such an epithet as applied to Dr. Temple was altogether unjust; but, nevertheless, he had associated himself with a number of men who had outraged the feelings of good Christian people by assailing principles which were generally regarded as of the essence of the Gospel, and they had done this as clergymen of the Anglican Church. If there was a good deal of ignorance and prejudice in the attack, there was a good deal of true religious feeling and of sound Christian instinct also, and still more was there the emphatic protest of the moral sense against such action on the part of men who, by the vows of their own subscription, were bound to maintain a narrow and rigid theology. We are willing to believe that Dr. Temple simply erred in

judgment, but it was just the kind of error which was sure to recoil upon him.

There is, too, a deeper question underlying all this, and it is one which is destined to be pressed with more urgency from both sides of our religious controversies. Is the Broad Church theory capable of being reconciled in any fair way with the facts of the case? Can the clergy act upon it with an honest regard to the obligations under which they have placed themselves? The teachings of the "Essays and Reviews" were able to stand the fiery ordeal through which they had to pass so far as the demands of the law were concerned; but is that enough to satisfy a conscientious man? Will a faithful servant, whose first desire is to be himself true, be content if he manages to escape the meshes of the net of the law, when all the time the common judgment of mankind tells him that his escape is due to legal subtleties and refinements only? He may boast that he is serving freedom, but can he deceive himself into the belief that he can really promote freedom by showing the possibility of adopting evasions which all men of tender consciences will spurn? He may fancy that he is rendering homage to truth by thus setting himself against popular errors; but truth demands the loyalty of heart and life as well as that of the intellect or the lips, and its interests can never be advanced by what wears the appearance of unfaithfulness to solemn professions. Mr. Leslie Stephen, speaking under the influence of sentiments in direct

and strong antagonism to those of the popular religion, utters just as emphatic a condemnation of the trifling with solemn obligations involved in the Broad Church action. "So long," he says, "as a Christian is preaching pure rationalism, but preaching it quite unconsciously, we may accept his alliance without discredit on either side; but when he becomes conscious of the divergence between his words and their plain meaning, and justifies his practice, we have a right to insist on a distinct answer to some obvious questions. What are the limits of the liberty which he claims? Does he disapprove of Mr. Voysey's mode of straining words? If so, where does he draw the line? If not, what is the amount of equivocation which he will permit? Is it possible to be dishonest in the use of religious language? It is absolutely necessary, he says, to allow the mixture of some alloy in the coins we pass for sound bullion. How much may be admitted? May the coins be made altogether of alloy? and if so, what is the difference between a forger and an honest man? Can it really be maintained that the essential thing is to use the proper stamp and not to deal in the genuine article?" The answer to such a question would be very promptly and decidedly given by the law if dealing with any other question except one relating to the Church. It has its penalty for the grocer who labels a mixture of coffee and chicory as coffee, but, strange to say, it allows any kind of adulteration in that spiritual food which the Church supplies to the nation, pro-

vided only it has on it the proper episcopal stamp. Statesmanlike considerations, we are told, justify such conduct on the part of the Courts; but even if they did—that is, if the integrity of the Establishment was worth securing by a sacrifice of the law—that can be no justification to any man in ignoring his own conscience. No decision of a Court can warrant a man in teaching what he does not believe, even though he knows there are others who teach it and yet believe no more than himself.

While speaking thus of the Broad Church and of its celebrated manifesto, it would be unfair to apply these observations to any man who honestly believes that the formularies of his Church sanction the theology of the school. How far Dr. Temple holds its principles, the world at large has no means of determining. It knows only that he was one of the essayists, that the prevalence of "advanced" theological opinions at Rugby was notorious, and that his appointment to the See of Exeter was regarded as a triumph of the Broad Church school, and was, therefore, the occasion of an agitation more fierce than any episcopal nomination of recent days except that of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. So fierce indeed did the excitement grow, that at one time it seemed as if it might precipitate the ecclesiastical crisis so often foretold but so long in coming. Of course the passion subsided, the hot words died away on the lips by which they were spoken, gradually the deluge of letters and articles ceased, and the movement collapsed as rapidly

as it had been developed. The opponents of Dr. Temple would have been entitled to respect if they had maintained their position, but, unfortunately, it was quite certain from the first that they would not, and they failed consequently to produce any impression. It is not surprising that men who hold fast by a definite creed—and the orthodox clergy say, in favour of what some call narrowness, that the Church requires them to accept and use three separate creeds—should object to acknowledge as bishop the representative of a school which seeks to get rid of all creeds, and therefore explains away those it is compelled to subscribe. Still less was it wonderful that those who believe in the authority of the Church should demur to the promotion of a contributor to a volume which had been publicly condemned in Convocation and denounced by most of the bishops, and who had never by a single word expressed dissent from his companions or regretted his own share in the publication. Men who resolved to defy the State rather than submit to such humiliation to their Church, such injury to what they esteem the truth, would have deserved all honour. But windy protests, fierce denunciations, angry complaints, empty threats, demonstrate only the vexation of the remonstrants, and answer no purpose except to relieve their own surcharged spirits. It is because there have been so many of these brave words which have had no result, that the Church is in the state of utter anarchy in which she is found to-day.

The conduct of Dr. Temple as bishop has certainly proved that the apprehensions entertained relative to him were at least greatly exaggerated. After the storm was past, he took the first opportunity of seeking to disarm the prejudices which had been roused against him, and ever since it seems to have been his aim to do his work faithfully and earnestly, and to deal impartially towards all sections. So far as the administration of his diocese is concerned, he has proved himself an able, manly, conscientious prelate, and has carried into his new sphere the same geniality of temper, tact in dealing with men, untiring industry and faithfulness in the discharge of duty, which had secured so large a measure of success in the old. If he desires to magnify his office, it is not by asserting its claims so much as by developing its capacities for usefulness, and his power is the more felt because of the previous decay of episcopal influence, owing in the first instance to the polemic tendencies of his predecessor, and in his later days to his unfitness through the infirmities of age for any active labour. To an Anglican bishop, Cornwall alone was sufficiently tempting as a field of missionary labour, and Dr. Temple has already shown himself desirous to do something towards winning back some of its lost tribes to the Establishment. But his mode of undertaking the work is very different from that of some of his episcopal brethren. He does not issue a pastoral against those troublesome Wesleyans, nor does he seek to coerce them into submission

by parading the claims of his Apostolical Succession, but he sets to work as a true minister of the Gospel. He will spend part of his summer vacation among the fishermen of a poor Cornish village, preaching to them and showing a friendly interest in them. He is always ready for good work, not caring for unpopularity, nor fearing to face the wrath of the Exeter publicans in his desire to play his part in the conflict against drunkenness.

No one who has observed the unquestionable earnestness, the thorough devotion to his work, the remarkable simplicity of the man, can doubt that he must be a power for good, and yet the suspicion will suggest itself that his episcopal position must often be an embarrassment to him. Nor, while he is honoured for many qualities that deserve honour, is it impossible to forget the danger that as the Churchman develops in him—and there is everything in the atmosphere of a cathedral and an episcopal palace to develop it—there will be a loss of some of the high qualities which characterised the man. His conduct in the unfortunate affair at Rugby has been severely criticised, and not without reason. It would have been more dignified if he had held himself aloof entirely, and, sagacious as his letter to the trustees was, and remarkable as was the penetration into Dr. Hayman's character which it showed, it is heartily to be wished it had never been written. Still this was only a fault of impulsiveness, of an anxious care for the prosperity of a school to which he must feel strong

attachment, perhaps of that self-complacency, not to say "bumptiousness," which we are told grows so luxuriantly at Rugby. These are failings which might easily be condoned, especially if it is remembered that underneath the whole lay a strong sympathy with his former colleagues and a conviction that the school was being sacrificed to party feeling. What puzzled the world most was the tone which he took in his reply to an address relative to the Confessional and other High Church practices, with the wonderful consideration for the Ritualists which he expressed, his respect for their labours, his belief in their loyalty to the Church, his desire to find an apology for their offences. He has not lost his sagacity, surely he has not cooled in his attachment to liberty. He must see that these men are deliberately engaged in an endeavour to effect a revolution in his Church: he cannot desire their success; can he possibly believe that his smooth words can have any effect except to increase their audacity and facilitate their work? There never was more need of a prelate at once liberal and fearless, who should have the courage to unmask the pretensions of this wretched parody of Romanism. It was hoped such a man had been found in the Bishop of Exeter. It is a grievous disappointment to find him chattering these feeble ecclesiastical platitudes, and showing that he has already sunk to the level of the peace-at-any-price prelates. Must it be taken for granted that when a Broad Churchman becomes a bishop, there is a tendency

in the breadth to become a vanishing quantity, while the Churchmanship becomes ever more advanced and predominant?

It may be doubted, however, whether the Churchmanship of the Bishop of Exeter will ever wholly efface the impression produced by the Head-master of Rugby. The ingenious, if hardly ingenuous, way in which the late Bishop Wilberforce dealt with his contribution to the "Essays and Reviews," seeking, by a series of quotations, taken in connection with passages selected from the other Essays, to show that, in fact, they were written on a distinct plan, and that his, as the opening paper, was intended to prepare the way for all the rest, created a prejudice which, when once formed, is not easily eradicated. The wonder is that the school did not suffer from it, and that even among those who professed their horror at the heresy, there were so many who did not hesitate to commit the religious education of their children to the heretic. Strong Tories would denounce, in no measured terms, the political and religious principles of the Head-master of Rugby, but having thus satisfied their conscience, would extol his discipline, and keep their boys at the school. Is it possible that these violent Tory protests do not mean so much as they seem, and are inspired less by an intelligent attachment to a system than by a desire to swell the fashionable cry of the hour? This is a thought which often suggests itself, and it is one which may well inspire the deepest anxiety as to the future of the

country. It might certainly have been supposed that the feeling about "Essays and Reviews," and against Dr. Temple in particular, would have exercised a very damaging effect on the school, whereas it was not more popular at any period of his administration than during his last years there.

An uneasy feeling, however, still lingers in the minds of the High Church clergy, which it is not likely he will overcome. They look upon his words and acts now as the result of his position as a bishop, and though they are compelled to admire his ability, his diligence, and his self-denying earnestness, there is still a secret feeling that he is not one of them. To a considerable extent, too, they are right. A thorough Churchman Dr. Temple proves himself. He believes in the Establishment, and would maintain it to the last, and that not so much by refuting its opponents, though he would not shrink from that, but by developing its power for good. He would, with the liberality characteristic of his school, deal as gently as possible even with the Ritualists, but to sacerdotalism he is opposed, and though his antagonism may not take a very active form, it brings him from time to time into collision with the feelings of many in his diocese. A good Churchman ought, for example, to have welcomed the Church Congress, which proposes to meet at Plymouth this year, with thorough heartiness; but it is not too much to say that Dr. Temple has given it the cold shoulder. He will take the chair, as he thinks it right for a bishop to preside over all

movements connected with the Church which take place within his territory; still, the way in which he gave his assent showed how little sympathy he has with the gathering, and indicated that it would have been more satisfactory to him if it were held elsewhere, even if it were not held at all.

Then his answer to a question addressed to him about Apostolical Succession, cannot have been very agreeable to those who attach supreme importance to the theory, unless, indeed, they found some consolation in feeling that his shuffling reply reflected only on himself. The Church, according to him, allows those of her clergy who will to hold the theory, and she is equally tolerant to those who do not; but the one thing which she has done is to secure the blessings of this mystical gift for all, even for those who disbelieve in it altogether. Even in the productions of episcopal weakness it would not be easy to find anything more lacking in manliness and decision than this remarkable deliverance of a man whose antecedents would have led us to expect something so different. To judge it rightly, it must be remembered that it was a reply to a memorial from a large body of communicants in his diocese, desirous of being relieved from some perplexity caused by the ambiguity of his Charge. This is the relief which the Bishop gives: "I have to observe that there can be no doubt that the Church of England has included, and has deliberately intended to include, within her limits, both those who hold and those who do not hold the doctrine of the

Apostolical Succession. She has accordingly most carefully provided that all her ministers shall have that succession as a matter of course; she has omitted from her Articles all mention of that succession as a matter of doctrine."

If a bishop's great object is to conceal his own opinion, and to give every party an idea that he has sympathy with it, his success is complete. The carefully-worded answer which it has become the fashion of Tory Ministers to read in reply to very simple questions, and which have the effect of throwing the Stock Exchange into a fever of excitement by their uncertainty, could not be more diplomatically framed. The art is perfect, but it is not exactly that in which it is most desirable for a bishop to excel. That it will avail him much with the High Church clergy who abound in his diocese is not very probable. There may not be many of them, like the late Vicar of Morwenstow, whose views were so extreme that he declared he should protest with his last breath that "the man Wesley" (who, by the way, was in the Apostolical Succession) "*corrupted and depraved, instead of improving,* the West of England, indeed, all the land," and in whose eyes the appointment of Dr. Temple was one of the many sins of the Anglican Church which drove him at last to find a home in the infallible Church of Rome. But after an administration like that of Dr. Philpotts, there must be a number of the clergy with strong High Church opinions, and they will be as much dissatisfied with the doubt-

fulness of Dr. Temple's testimony to the doctrine as more liberal men were half amused and half disgusted with his inane talk about the fact. Adapting two well-known lines it may be truly said:

> "Who could but laugh a Bishop such to see,
> Who could not weep if Atticus is he."

But it is not on these points only that Dr. Temple, whilst trying to purge himself from some of the reproach to which his breadth of view had exposed him, has failed to obtain credit for his Churchmanship. He is no favourite with the Church defenders who swarm in the western districts, and whose rowdyism must be a great annoyance to him. The spirit of a party which shrinks from fair discussion, and hopes to succeed by such arbitrary proceedings as those of the Mayor of Plymouth, or such riotous conduct as has disgraced some meetings in Exeter itself, is altogether alien from his own; and while he shrinks from their coarseness and intolerance, they are disgusted by what they regard as his timidity, if they would not give it a harder name. He has, on more than one occasion, suffered from the violence of an Exeter mob, who fitly represent the alliance between the Church and the publicans, equally ready to put the Bishop down when he advocates temperance, as to silence Mr. Gordon when he opposes the Establishment. Dr. Temple is bold enough when he has to defy them, and is to be honoured for his resolute efforts to grapple with the monster evil of intemperance.

It is only when the interests of the Establishment are thought to be at stake that he shows a feebleness so unlike his better self.

He is not blind, however, to its defects, and is prepared to make personal sacrifices in order to remove them. If he has shown no faculty for healing its divisions or adjusting its doctrinal difficulties, he has shown a commendable desire for increasing its efficiency. His offer to give up part of his own income in order to provide for a Bishop of Cornwall is a proof of his sincerity, and shows at once his belief in the system, and his superiority to many personal considerations. He feels the responsibility of his position, and endeavours conscientiously to perform its duties.

THE LATE CANON KINGSLEY.

THE tribute of affectionate respect and deep sympathy which the early and unexpected death of Mr. Kingsley called forth, was a remarkable testimony to the true worth of the man. As he lay hovering between life and death in that quiet village rectory which he loved so well, and where he seems to have kindled so much enthusiasm and love in return, the anxious interest with which the reports of his state were scanned, showed that the people generally shared in the feeling which the Heir-Apparent—in this showing the spirit of his mother—exhibited in so considerate a manner. When the struggle ended, and the tidings went forth that the ardent, true-hearted, and chivalrous Rector of Eversley was no more, there was a general outburst of sorrow, which showed how strong and wide-spread was the hold he had gained upon the imaginations and hearts of Englishmen. It may be said that much of this was due to the circumstances of his death, in presence of which all adverse criticism was hushed, while the more kindly and sympathetic feelings of

all classes and parties were strongly evoked. But whatever weight attaches to this consideration, it does not explain the general sentiment which the event elicited, and which was the more remarkable because Canon Kingsley was the very last man to court popularity, and in various ways had, from time to time, exposed himself to keen strictures. Though he was a literary man of high order, a large number of the critics hardly appreciated his worth until he was gone, and of late years particularly had been more inclined to insist on his defects, to place his writings under the light of that literary microscope of incredible magnifying power, which a certain writer in the *Saturday Review* is so fond of using, and especially to sneer at that impulsiveness, or rather that deep human feeling, which was so characteristic of him. The influence of this cold, cynical spirit in the literary circles of London can be understood only by those who have been brought into close contact with it, or carefully noted its developments. It has no patience, as Mr. Gladstone has found, with statesmen who desire to keep their consciences alive and their hearts fresh and susceptible. Mr. Kingsley, with his eager and generous nature, his intense sympathies, his vivid imagination—which, it cannot be denied, sometimes overmastered other faculties—was a puzzle and an offence to it; and its organs often applied the lash with considerable vigour, and to such an extent, that it appeared as though they were insensible to his real genius.

On the other hand, Churchmen in general were not particularly drawn to a clergyman who, though intellectually and morally a distinguished ornament of the Church, to whose principles and institutions he was certainly strongly attached, was generally regarded as somewhat of a heretic, an advanced member of that Broad Church party who, by their plausible theories of comprehension and by their personal qualities, do so much to strengthen the Establishment, but who are, nevertheless, viewed with doubt and suspicion by those who profit so largely from their reputation and influence. Many of his public appearances, too, were calculated to excite a good deal of antagonism in various quarters His ardent defence of Governor Eyre provoked the opposition of those decided and consistent Liberals who were not prepared to find in "Parson Lot," who had dared so courageously to advocate the cause of English labourers, a champion of the oppressor of poor negroes. His equally vehement and ill-judged attack on Father Newman lowered his prestige in the eyes of another class, and one which exercises no slight influence on public opinion. Finally, his extraordinary defence of the Athanasian Creed, so contrary to what all but those who had carefully studied him and his principles expected from him, astonished and annoyed numbers of those who had been wont to regard him with the strongest admiration. That all this should be forgotten when he was so suddenly taken away, was not

surprising; but in the estimates given of him by the press there was much more than a mere desire to bury the memory of his mistakes in his grave—there was a hearty recognition of his genius and his worth, which proved that underneath the criticism which his words and deeds often called forth, there was a just appreciation of his many high qualities. Those who were in absolute agreement with him might be few, but in all classes were numbers who felt that he was a true man, worthy of honour and of love.

Charles Kingsley was a thorough Englishman —an Englishman in his weakness as well as in his strength, in his faults as in his virtues. Whether he set forth the wrongs of English peasants, or celebrated the heroism of English soldiers; whether he dealt with the problems of other ages and other countries, or those of our land and time; whether he told the stirring deeds of the great captains of Elizabeth's day, or stood forth as the defender of one who in the excitement and panic of a sudden peril had forgotten everything but the necessity of maintaining the prestige and authority of his nation; whether he threw himself into the breach in defence of a creed which has become an institution of the country, or, recklessly trampling both upon logic and theology, taught lessons which it was impossible to reconcile with its dogmas;—everywhere, despite this apparent inconsistency, he spoke and acted as an Englishman, proud of his people, imbued with their

prejudices, strong in all their instincts. The love of daring adventure which is so conspicuous in his heroes was as fully developed in himself; and with it were combined that chivalrous courage, that lofty scorn of meanness and hypocrisy, that passionate zeal for freedom, and, above all, that ardent devotion to truth and justice, which he illustrated as beautifully in his own life as he portrayed them in those of others.

There was something to admire even in that "muscular Christianity" of which he has been called the apostle, but which has become a very different thing with numbers of his *soi-disant* admirers and followers—in whose eyes a perfect athlete is about the highest type of man—from what it was in the mind of Mr. Kingsley, whose ideal was a man well-developed in all parts of his nature, with cultivated mind, and sensitive conscience, and loving heart, as well as with a vigorous physique. Probably he attached too much value to physical qualities; and yet in that also his taste was English: on himself its influence was healthy. The love of nature, the sympathy with animals, the pleasure in manly exercises, are all native to the soil; and when kindred qualities are developed in intellectual work, when the man shows the same robustness of thought and breadth of sympathy everywhere, when he is as ready to defy public opinion in defence of what he esteems the right, as to venture on some trying and perilous feat, he is sure, sooner or later, to win true

popularity. It is interesting and encouraging to those who have to fight up-hill battles to see how, almost despite of itself, the world comes to look kindly on men of this stamp. Their work has to be to some extent accomplished, or at all events their own position pretty well assured, before the current which at first sets in against independent men turns; but sooner or later the world comes to judge charitably, and even favourably, those who dare to oppose its evils, to rebuke its errors, or to war against its prejudices. When it is once seen that they war against institutions and not men, for principles, not for personal objects, justice is ultimately done to those who at first were objects of general scorn or hatred. So when Mr. Kingsley's brief career was over, even those who had been most severe in their censures of what they regarded as inconsistencies or indiscretions, were the first to acknowledge the great loss which the world had sustained in the removal of one with spirit so noble and with heart so true.

For it is to his honour that whatever Kingsley was as a scholar, an author, or an ecclesiastic, it was as a man that he was most to be honoured. It would not be too much to say that even his errors were to some extent redeemed, even in the eyes of those who felt most deeply about them, by the nobility of the spirit which they manifested. Nobody could suppose that his defence of Governor Eyre, which was one of the greatest mistakes he committed, was due to any feeling but an over-

strained and unreasoning chivalry, which led him to become the advocate of one who, in his endeavour to prevent a great calamity, had laid himself open to popular obloquy. Those who believed him to have misapprehended the facts and misjudged the policy, could still give him credit for pure motives in the course which he pursued. A man of strong affections and noble impulses, a man who won the hearts of others by the warmth and constancy of his own, all who knew him declare him to have been. Mr. Maurice, his intimate friend, or rather his beloved leader, said of him that "he was the best son, the best father, the best husband, the best friend, the best parish priest, he ever knew." This is a very high eulogy, and yet there are many who were intimate with the late Rector of Eversley who would corroborate it to the fullest extent. The admirer and friend who records the saying in a recent number of *Macmillan's Magazine* endorses it, and tells us what in fact might have been gathered alike from the tone of his writings and the cast of his countenance, that he was "one of the most charming companions, as well as one of the best and truest of friends." If his intimates knew this, the outside world, which had not the privilege of familiar intercourse with him, still instinctively felt that it was so, and it was one great secret of the popularity which he enjoyed.

I remember well the only time I ever had the pleasure of hearing him. Though it is now several years ago, the impression produced is as fresh

as though it were a thing of yesterday. I happened to be in Cambridge when he was delivering one of his "prelections" as Professor of Modern History, and being desirous of seeing and hearing one with whom his writings seemed to have established a certain kind of acquaintanceship, I found my way to the dingy lecture-room in which he was to discourse, and I was certainly well rewarded for the trouble. There was nothing of the conventional college lecture, as it used to be in my own younger days, about his address. It was fresh, bright, lively, suggestive, and it is probable that sober dons, especially of the old school, would have said that it was not lecturing. And if their ideal of a lecture were to be accepted as the true one, that is, if it was only to be an item of the grand process of "cram," to which university teaching is too often degraded, and if the highest achievement be to give the greatest amount of information in the shortest possible time and the dullest possible way, there could be no doubt as to the truth of their judgment. Mr. Kingsley's lecture was the very last instrument one would employ to prepare a youth for examination; but if the object of his education is to prepare him for life, to stimulate the intellect rather than to qualify for immediate success, its value would be very considerable. My recollection of his subject is of the most general character, but I remember the force, the freshness, and the beauty with which it was treated. Mr. Freeman would doubtless have found a great many inaccura-

cies in his statements and flaws in his reasonings, and possibly his students would not have gained any greater knowledge of English history if they had carried all his lecture away in their memory. But if they were capable of being inspired, they could not but have been profited by having come even for so brief a time under the spell of his genius.

There was something in the very aspect of the man to interest and attract. His face told of an active intellect, a sympathetic heart, a firm and resolute purpose. Refined as it was, its lines were indicative of real force, and if it did not reveal the power to rule, it certainly told of the skill to attract and win. The lecture, both in matter and manner, was in keeping with it. Its speculations were ingenious, and the groupings of facts by which they were sustained, striking and clever. The generalisation appeared to be too hasty, so that it was not possible at once to acquiesce in all the conclusions reached. But that was matter of small importance. It was the new light in which old facts had been placed, and the different aspect which they had thus presented; the suggestion of relations between them which one had never suspected, but which could not be started without setting the mind on a fresh line of thought and inquiry; and the play of poetic fancy round the whole, investing it with a rare beauty, that constituted the charm of the lecture. Whether a college hall was the proper place for it may be open to discussion. It is difficult to say what is the proper

place for genius in this work-a-day world. For plodding talent, which is never disturbed itself, and never disturbs others, by any startling suggestions, which is never afraid of being dull provided it can be successful, and turns up its nose at the brilliancy which does not secure great results, there is room enough, and no lack of honours and places to reward its prudence and industry. But genius astonishes commonplace men by what they deem its wildness and eccentricity. It often shocks them by its daring and independence. It is ever pluming its wings for lofty flights which they cannot follow, and though they are prepared to gaze and sometimes even admire its work, they doubt whether it is exactly suited to a sphere like this. And yet it is a power, and a power which those young men who thronged the dingy hall at Cambridge unquestionably felt. Mr. Kingsley's stirring words may have done as much to rouse activity in their minds —which, after all, is a far more important thing in education than merely to instil ideas or communicate knowledge—than many lectures which were more *en règle* and more in harmony with old university traditional precedents.

For Charles Kingsley was a genius. There was the ring of true genius, and of the heart which often accompanies it, in all that he said and did. His simple ballads, so soft and tender, so true to nature, and so rich in noble sentiment; his novels, varied in subject, and ever so unlike the conventional type; his sermons, sometimes so uncertain in their

theology, but so inspiring in their tone and so practical in their aim, were all full of it. To criticise any of them is one of the simplest but one of the least profitable of tasks. It would not be difficult to prove that "Yeast" was wild and even dangerous in some of its speculations, that the heroes of "Westward Ho!" and "Two Years Ago" were sadly deficient, and especially that the dogmatic teaching of many of the sermons was open to grave exception. I do not make light of any of these points, least of all of the last. But when every objection has been raised and fairly considered, there is a power about them which is irresistible. The reader feels still that he has been brought into contact with one who has enlarged his views and quickened his sympathies, and who in some mysterious way, which it would not be easy to explain, has attracted the heart to himself. It is an old story. Genius is erratic and wayward, inconsistent and often unpractical, but it has a fascination which few are able to resist, and still fewer would desire to resist.

How wondrously the power which we describe by this term can light up and glorify all that it touches, is abundantly illustrated by the various productions of Mr. Kingsley's pen. Reviewers, and not those of the class at whom Mr. Disraeli sneers as unsuccessful authors, but rather men of more sober temper, more logical precision, and possibly more accurate knowledge than the writer, assailed him, and sometimes unmercifully, but they could not deny the

beauty of his striking pictures, still less could they weaken their effect on the popular mind. Perhaps the book that was most keenly criticised was the course of University lectures on "The Gaul and the Teuton," and no doubt the strictures were mainly just. But who is there that has read those charming and suggestive sketches, who does not feel that the whole subject has been invested with a fresh interest which stimulates him to further inquiry? Or, to take another and very different example. The "Ode to the East Wind" may seem a strange vagary to those who are shivering under the fierce blasts of a March gale, or depressed by the gloom of one of those melancholy days which sometimes intrude even into the brightness of May, when not a gleam of sunshine lights up the grey sky, and not a soft breath mitigates the harshness of the biting air. But Mr. Kingsley has nevertheless succeeded in imparting a touch of poetic beauty to this very uninviting subject. The "wind of God" which braces "brain and sinew" calls up, indeed, very different associations from those of these bitter days,—thoughts of bright, clear, if somewhat hard skies, with fresh, crisp, stimulating air; but even so it is not easy to justify to critical minds the language of this stirring ode, and it is a great triumph of genius that it has been able, to some degree at least, to overcome such objections, and secure so high a place for a poem the idea of which to numbers seems strained and unreal. For myself, I have often felt, even while

breasting the fury of one of these nor'-easters, or chilled by its icy blasts, that there was more truth in Mr. Kingsley's utterances than would be generally admitted.

They were at all events eminently true to his own character. No one had more contempt for the "soft sou'-wester," which he describes as the "ladies' breeze," or exulted more in the stir of life, in the struggle for the right, in the active pursuit of progress. In an age of ease and luxury, whose corruptions and sins he early began to denounce, he felt the need of purifying influences, which, though they should be harsh and trying as the blasts of Boreas, might nevertheless clear the air, and minister some needed stimulus to the moral and spiritual pulses of England. This thought may be discerned running through most of his novels, from "Hypatia"—which, as its second title indicates, was intended to be not only a picture of the past, but a parable for the present—down to "Two Years Ago." The former novel is perhaps his greatest book, but it is more—it is one of the most accurate and brilliant reproductions of a forgotten world that we have. Its affluence of learning is remarkable, but not more so than the richness of many of its descriptions and the suggestiveness of its lessons. The danger perhaps is, lest the attention should be so concentrated on the beauties of the picture as to forget that the foes of truth, purity, and goodness which are there represented, are only the same we have to encounter in our own

day, and that even to this age the prophet would say, *De te fabula narratur.*

How far the remedy which Kingsley desired to apply would have met the evils he so eloquently exposed, is another point. He had infinite faith in a sound and healthy development of the whole man, and so far most men must be in sympathy with him. There is, perhaps, nothing in which the Evangelical type of religion is so deficient as this. It seems to have forgotten that humanity is many-sided, and especially has neglected the cultivation of its masculine elements. Kingsley, however, rushed to the opposite extreme, and went very far towards a worship of mere physical force. It would not be true to say that he did not appreciate the gentler virtues. But in his contempt for all morbid sentiment, his admiration of power exerted to put down what he regarded as evil, his exultation in the success of Englishmen everywhere, even though in buccaneering enterprises, which were as cruel in their deeds as they were piratical in their designs, he glorified brute power in a way which was very welcome to a certain class of Englishmen, but was not calculated to promote the interests of true civilisation, still less of religion. In the manly ideas of life he sought to inculcate; in the conception of the sanctity of the commonest acts and scenes which ever inspires his utterances; in the scorn he never fails to pour on the distorted ideal of virtue so dear to priests and their followers; and in, what is the basis of the whole, the assertion of the rights of

Christ as King over all the world and all human life, which is the most characteristic feature of his teachings, he says so much that needed to be boldly and strongly said, that it must always be matter of regret that the influence of this sound and valuable truth should have been marred both by its sins of omission and commission; that he should have left out other truth, which is even more essential to the completeness and power of a gospel for this age, or for any age; and that he should have pushed his ideas to such extremes as to convert them into pernicious errors.

No wise man would object to have in a clergyman what one of his sincere, though discriminating, admirer sees in Kingsley, and describes as "the note of his genius"—a "breeziness, the power of conveying to the reader a sense of rapid and joyous movement through a clear and strengthening atmosphere—of flushing the cheek as air does, of quickening the pulses as a gallop does, of tuning the nerves to pleasure till mere living is enjoyable, as skating always seems to envious lingerers on the bank to do." It is quite true that this is "not characteristic of Mr. Kingsley's profession." It would be fortunate if it were; if a true, robust, spiritual manhood was felt to be one of the highest qualifications for the Christian ministry; if the active virtues received at least as much credit as is given to morbid developments of the passive ones; if moral courage held as high a place in the ideal of the Church as it did in the minds of the Apostles; if

Christian teachers, in particular, understood that they must be good soldiers, leaders, and examples in that conflict against evil which is as real to-day as in the first century, and if in the midst of their struggles there was that joyous trust, combined with undaunted resolve, which should characterise all who feel that they are fighting for the world's true King, and are assured of victory. But there should be also a more spiritual element in the Christian teacher, and this Mr. Kingsley lacked. On the other hand, he was too much disposed to glorify forces which never have worked, and never can work, for the regeneration of the world. His teaching is that of a clear-headed, warm-hearted, brave, and generous Englishman, with not a few prejudices, but with a large and noble soul, full of a tenderness which would be little suspected by those who get their idea of him from his glowing pictures of deeds of violence approaching to brutality. Still it was not what might have been anticipated from the preacher of a Gospel whose essence is love. Some parts of that Gospel had a strong attraction for him. In all its scorn of falsehood and meanness, in all its sympathy with the weak and suffering (provided they were not suffering at the hands of Englishmen, when it was to be assumed that they were suffering the just reward of their deeds, as in the case of Spaniards massacred by Elizabeth's buccaneers, or negroes sacrificed by Governor Eyre), in all its honour to meek and patient endurance, he shared,

and set forth its truths with his characteristic eloquence. But here he stopped, and into the heart of the doctrine of Christ he was unable to penetrate.

He was, then, in fact, the preacher of a system which does not reach the deepest necessities of the human soul, even as it does not unfold the most precious truths of the Divine redemption. He was essentially one with Mr. Maurice in his doctrine: but Mr. Maurice was a philosophic thinker; Mr. Kingsley a skilful artist, who presented the salient features of the doctrine, as they appeared to him, with singular force and beauty. It would be far more difficult to extract a consistent theory from the vivid and glowing sermons of the latter, than from the elaborate dissertations of the former, vague and unsatisfactory as they often were. This, however, was common to both: they had little if any faith in the objective view of the Atonement. Doubtless Mr. Maurice has done valuable service by bringing out prominently the subjective view of our Lord's work, hitherto too much neglected, as well as by correcting the too hard, logical, and almost material form in which the doctrine of substitution had been presented. But, as in all reactions, the pendulum swung too far in the opposite direction. It was so in his own case, and still more in that of others. Mr. Kingsley, however, was in no sense a theological teacher. He had got hold of a bright and joyous idea of the Gospel, which was in perfect accord with his temperament and his cheery view of the world, and

he presents it with touching eloquence. It is as pleasant and genial, but as one-sided and superficial, a representation of the Gospel as could well be conceived, and it is maintained with all the force which intensity of conviction gives. His teaching abounds in generous sentiment and glows with earnestness, and even passion. His Gospel is set forth with undoubting confidence as a message from Heaven, whose character and meaning the world had hardly begun to appreciate; but it is not, as we read it, the Gospel as proclaimed by Paul and Peter and John.

The position of Mr. Kingsley in the Anglican Church, like that of his leader, was anomalous and unfortunate. It is not easy to see how any man of impartial and unbiassed mind could read the formularies which they had subscribed, and were bound to obey, and say that their theology had a rightful standing in the Establishment. Whether it ought to be admitted in a national Church is not at all the question that is raised, for however the state of things at present may seem to indicate the contrary, the comprehensiveness on which Broad Churchmen insist as the great merit of the Establishment, is not the idea on which it was based, and is not in any fair way to be reconciled with the law by which it is constituted and governed. It is perfectly true that there is as much diversity of opinion within as outside its borders, and men of Mr. Kingsley's views may reasonably argue that they have as much right to its pulpits and dignities as others

by whom they are enjoyed. This, however, is not the plea that has been urged in their favour, but, on the contrary, attempts have been made to show that their teaching is in harmony with the requirements of the Creeds by an abuse of language which has offended the common-sense, where it has not revolted the conscience, of men. No one has a right to impeach the conscientiousness of those by whom the plea was urged; but however sincere they may have been, the effect of a mode of dealing with language which makes it assert the very things all the world beside understand it to contradict, and contradict the very things which its words, construed in their ordinary sense, certainly teach, could not fail to be unfortunate. The climax was reached when Mr. Kingsley came out as a defender of the Athanasian Creed; but there can be no doubt that his position was taken in perfect good faith, and that he had no conception of the aspect his action presented to all the world except himself.

In one sense it might be said that Canon Kingsley was made to be an English squire, varying his enjoyment of those pleasures and pursuits of the country of which he was so intensely fond, with congenial literary labours. But it is impossible to ignore the happy influence he exerted, and the pleasant memories he has left, among the parishioners of Eversley. Whatever their views as to the deficiencies of his teaching, all must do honour to that noble, beautiful, and kindly spirit which attracted all who came near him, and made him a

power for good in his parish. He was one of the finest specimens of the "educated Christian gentleman" which it is the special business of the Establishment to supply, but, at the same time, his religious teaching would be repudiated by both of the powerful Church parties as defective, if not erroneous. But surely all may think gratefully of the literary artist by whom they have so often been charmed, and of the Englishman of sympathies so broad and national, that he was able to do justice to the qualities of the Puritans, to whose theology and ecclesiastical principles alike he was opposed.

THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

THE sound High Churchman of the old school seems in a fair way of dropping out of existence altogether. The "High and dry" men who had often little learning and still less piety, whose apathy and indolence, even where they had no greater faults, contributed so largely to the growth of Dissent in rural districts, under whose administration not only did religion languish, but the very edifices and services of their Church were allowed to fall into neglect and decay, whose ritual was as slovenly as their preaching was feeble, and who cared as little for æsthetic beauty as for spiritual truth and power, have for some time been rapidly diminishing in number, and it will be a happy thing for the Church when they are an extinct species. But there was another section of the High Church party, who represented as accurately as any men can the ideal of the Anglican Church, of a very different character. They were men of devout spirit, of distinguished learning, and of devoted loyalty to their Church.

Accepting the teachings of their Church as though they were a second revelation, and reposing implicit faith in the authority which belonged to her as a branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, they did not trouble themselves about the logical inconsistencies of their position, but were able with the most perfect equanimity to talk the language of Protestatism to Romanists, and then, turning round, to address themselves in a style not unworthy of the most extreme Romanist to the unfortunate Dissenter who had dared to apply to their Church the very principles on which they judged and condemmed that of Rome. A position more incapable of defence can hardly be conceived, but they were never troubled about it, and, to do them justice, they did not for the most part greatly distress themselves about those who would not admit their claims. It may sound paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true, that the extravagance of their pretensions to some extent preserved them from violence in enforcing them. The elevation from which they looked down upon schismatics and Dissenters, whether Romish or Protestant, was so lofty that its calm serenity was hardly disturbed by polemic strife or sectarian bitterness. They pitied those who were insensible to the attractions of the purest branch of the Catholic Church, and they might hint their fears as to the possible destiny of rebels against an authority so indefeasible and yet so gentle; but it was rarely that they threw themselves into any active efforts for the suppression of Dissent,

contenting themselves generally with a dignified assertion of their authority, and regarding schism as one of the many forms of evil against which they had to contend, but which in God's good time would be extinguished.

This type of Churchman is rapidly making way for another, more eager, energetic, and aggressive in spirit; it must be added, also, more consistent in the development of its own principles. This latter class has all the advantage of youth, spirit, resolution, and, what is not less important, distinctness of aim and singleness of purpose, on its side. A party like this is sure, especially in an age like ours, to prevail over a more cautious, hesitating body, halting in its opinions and feeble in its policy; and thus the High Church school of the last generation is being transformed into the "Catholic" or "Mediævalist," or, according to the latest Oxford nomenclature, the "Ultramarine," party of our own day.

There are, however, still some representatives of this High Church party left, and among the most renowned, respected, and honoured of them is Dr. Wordsworth, the Bishop of Lincoln. In his faith in the supreme authority of the Church, in his aversion to purely Protestant ideas, in his assertions of the efficacy of sacraments, he goes almost as far as the strongest Ritualist could desire. But here his sympathy with the school ceases, and with him it is not caution or timidity that operates to prevent an open approval of teaching or practices which in his secret heart he regards with favour, but a distinct and

conscientious opposition to these extreme views. As a strong Anglican, he is a decided anti-Ritualist. He is so far from sharing the tenderness for the Romish Church which that party have shown—but which, it must be added, was much more common a few years ago than it has been of late, since Rome has shown her determination to make no concession, and since it has been found that the doctrines and practices which made her so attractive may be enjoyed to the fullest extent in the Anglican Church, —that he treats that Church as a schismatical community, and identifies her with the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse. So far, too, is he from committing himself to their sacramental practices, that in his last Charge he speaks of some of them in terms of strongest reprobation. Fasting communion, non-communicating attendance, the priest turning his back upon the people while offering the consecration prayer, and the enforcement of private confession, are condemned by him, and condemned in a manner which indicates his sense of the great peril to which the Church is exposed from the determination of these extreme Anglicans to press them. There can be no doubt that he considers himself as one of the most sturdy opponents which Ritualism has to meet upon the Bench, and that the strength which it has gained is due to an unfaithfulness to those great principles of the English Church of which he is the consistent and courageous champion. Puritanism has made Ritualism, and Ritualism is producing Puritanism; and in their keen antagonism

to each other, the eager adherents of both systems will not see that the true answer to the errors against which they are contending is to be found, not in an opposing error of their own, but in that wise, moderate, and scriptural view of Christian truth held by the Church of England and her faithful son, the Bishop of Lincoln.

He would probably be surprised to be told that with all his opposition to Ritualism, he is really giving it greater help and encouragement than if he were more directly and avowedly in sympathy with it. It is interesting, if not amusing, to see Dr. Wordsworth, standing on that narrow neck of land—and, a very narrow neck indeed it is—on which alone he thinks a secure and firm footing is to be found, and addressing himself to the mighty oceans rolling on either side and lashed to unusual fierceness and fury by the storms of the age, in the expectation that his feeble adjurations will stay their wild waves. Alas, his puny voice is hardly heard at all amid the war and din of the tempest, and those who do hear, laugh his appeals and warnings to scorn. As for the Ritualists, they accept his principles of Church authority and sacerdotal right, and use them for their own advantage. He is strong in the early Fathers, but why should they, when the appeal to tradition has once been made, content themselves with reference to those authorities whom he quotes? He rests much on the "judicious Hooker;" but however judicious and eminent Hooker may be, he

is not the only great Anglican divine, and if we begin to call in witnesses as to the theology of the Anglican Church, there are a goodly number who may fairly claim to be heard on the opposite side.

So in relation to the Eucharist, though the Bishop takes what may be regarded as a Protestant view, he makes concessions which are extremely dangerous, and may very easily be turned against himself. He should have full credit for sincerity, and for some courage in speaking so plainly on the points to which he refers in his Charge, yet it is easy to see how the effect of his condemnation is destroyed by some of his other statements. "In the Holy Communion," he says, "there is a perpetual commemorative representation of the One all-sufficient Sacrifice, offered once for all upon the cross, and the efficacy of that sacrifice is there pleaded before God; and in this sense the Eucharist may be called a commemorative sacrifice." It is possible of course to hold this, and yet to deny that there is any transubstantiation of the sacramental elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, or any actual repetition of the sacrifice by the priest at the altar, but the one view is divided from the other by but a thin line, and may easily develop into it, especially when we have in addition this view of the functions of the priest: "He is an *angelus ascendens* to God from men on earth with prayer, and he is an *angelus descendens* from God in heaven to men with blessing, and with the precious gifts of pardon, and grace, and life

immortal, bestowed in communion with Christ, Very God and man, on all penitent and faithful receivers of that Holy Sacrament." In like manner the Bishop finds, or thinks he has found, a *via media* on the subject of Confession. Lord Shaftesbury himself might be satisfied with his statement as to the evils of private confession. "I shrink from the thought of the anatomical dissection of consciences to which such votaries are required to submit, and from that long catalogue of interrogatories which may be seen in any 'Manual of Confession' as taught and practised by the Church of Rome, and which are an outrage against modesty and virtue." But his lordship's satisfaction, and that of Protestants generally, would be considerably qualified when they learned that while "the Church of England does not enforce confession as a rule, she admits and approves it as an exception." The Bishop is quite right, and only sets forth a fact which the ardent Protestants in the Establishment are very desirous of ignoring, but in the encouragement thus given to the practice "as an exception," everything is conceded. The Church can hardly be said to disapprove in principle of that which she admits even as an exception. Besides, the sanction she gives in the Prayer-Book to these exceptional cases is purely of "private interpretation," and the discrimination between the cases to which it does and those to which it does not apply must be the "private interpretation" of each individual priest. It is very possible that he may be "some youthful

priest, perhaps (pardon the supposition) neither learned nor discreet, and who may be more able to create scruples and doubtfulness in the minds of others than to quiet them by the ministry of God's Holy Word," but, nevertheless, to him belongs the right of deciding when he ought to urge private confession, and to whom and on what conditions he will grant that absolution which the Church has distinctly authorised him to pronounce. The Ritualists, instead of being induced by this style of reasoning to abandon their own views, might rather plead the Bishop's arguments in their favour. "In the medical treatment of our perishable bodies, quackery is punishable by law. Surely spiritual empiricism, which may jeopardise the health of immortal souls, ought not to escape scot-free." If we were Ritualists, taking this in connection with the admission that there is to be confession in exceptional cases—which of course will be those that present features of peculiar difficulty—we should contend that the right conclusion from such premises was the necessity for appointing the order of confessors which they are so anxious to establish.

These are only illustrations of the difficulties which High Churchmen like Dr. Wordsworth have to meet, and they explain the manner in which they have prepared the way for the men whom they regard with distrust and sometimes even positive aversion, but who are, nevertheless, their own lineal and legitimate descendants. He says: "The greatest

friends of Puritanism in our Church (though we do not suppose they are aware of it) are they who attempt to Romanise it." Well, of course, the more extreme the anti-Protestant development, the more decided will be the rebound in the opposite direction, but it is unjust in the teachers of anti-Puritan or anti-Protestant principles to attribute the result they deplore to those whose great fault is that they have been too loyal and consistent as their disciples. There is, however, a singular and refreshing verdure of intellect about the Bishop which would preserve him from being troubled by such thoughts as these. By what process a man can bring himself to believe that the Church of England has had such special light and wisdom communicated to her, that she is entitled to treat all who oppose her claims as rebels against God, whose only hope of salvation, whatever be their faith or virtue, is in those "uncovenanted mercies" which may reach the case of some who have excluded themselves from his covenant of grace by separating from his true Church, it is not easy to conceive. The Church of Rome has, at least, the unbroken traditions of more than a thousand years, the admission of her power by a large proportion of professing Christendom, and a multitude of surroundings which, at least, lend a shadow of support to her preposterous claim. She lays down as a fundamental principle the supreme right of the Church, and she has carried it out. There is no older community from which she has dissented, for

even the great schism of the Eastern and Western Church was rather the parting of two rivals, each of whom claimed to be the representative of Catholicity, than the attempt of either section to overthrow the authority it had hitherto confessed, and to exercise its private judgment by reforming that Catholic Church of which it was only a part. But the Anglican Church holds no such ground, and yet such men as Dr. Wordsworth assert for her an authority little short of that claimed by Pius IX.

The well-known Pastoral of the Bishop, addressed to the Wesleyans, is, in fact, so Popish in spirit and in claims, that a man might, in reading it, fancy that he had got hold of a rescript from the Vatican, were it not for the more genial and kindly spirit which it breathes. It is so complete a revelation of the man that it deserves our special notice. There is in Dr. Wordsworth very much of the recluse and ascetic. He has been so little affected by the influences of modern thought and life, that he speaks and writes rather as a man of two centuries ago, and one who even then had seldom gone far beyond the confines of his own study, than as a bishop charged with the administration of a diocese in this busy, stirring, free nineteenth century. He is the representative of authority, and it is his simply to assert it. He can hardly be ignorant that there are numbers who would challenge his right altogether, but he writes with all that sublime confidence which one who

had received a direct commission from God might assume. The idea of addressing a Pastoral to Wesleyans, who had forsaken the communion of his Church, and who, with all the foolish talk of some of their leaders about the Established Church and their childish desire not to be classed as Dissenters, are as proud of their independence and as intensely attached to their own Church as any of our denominations, would hardly have occurred to one less possessed with the ecclesiastic and sacerdotal spirit. It is tolerably certain that a great many of the prelates, and even some of them who appear to be most liberal, hold precisely the same views that he expresses, but for many reasons they would not have adopted such a mode of expressing them. But Dr. Wordsworth seems unconscious of the ridicule that he must draw upon himself, and the injury he will do his Church. It is hardly conceivable that a man in his rational mind could be ignorant that the Wesleyan who did not laugh at him would probably be roused to an indignation which might convert him into a supporter of Mr. Miall. Yet the Bishop is perfectly rational, and, what is more, he is a devout, well-meaning man, with a faith in his fetish, the Church—but in all other respects intelligent and able. The arrogance of his Pastoral is, of course, offensive, but the offence is greatly mitigated by the extreme innocence which pervades it. It is not easy to be angry with a man who seems so entirely insensible to the state of the world

around him, who is dwelling in a dreamland of his own, and seems to fancy that others will believe in his visions as much as he believes in them himself.

The occasion of the Pastoral was instructive. A clergyman of his diocese had been distressed by the inscription on a tombstone in the churchyard "In memory of ——, a happy labourer in the Wesleyan Methodist Church." That his parishioners should thus be led to suppose that the Wesleyan society was a Church, that, in fact, there could be any Church in England except that which the State establishes, was an offence to this good man, who applies to his deeply-sympathising Bishop to ascertain what could be done. The Bishop was too wary to advise the removal of the stone, for that he knew was contrary to law, but he gave this advice in the interests, we suppose, of orthodoxy if not of peace: "Liberate your conscience. Disabuse your people of erroneous notions. Imitate the Apostle Paul, who beheld an altar at Athens and took a text from it, and preached a sermon upon it. Use this inscription in your churchyard as a subject for one or more sermons to your people, on the present relation of Wesleyanism to the Church, and on the sin and unhappiness of schism, and on the duty and blessedness of Unity in the Truth." Example, however, is always better than precept, and so the Bishop proceeds to do himself what he advised the clergyman to do. There is but one thought, presented over and over again in different

forms, running through the whole of this appeal, and that is, that the Wesleyans are guilty of the sin of schism, and that their first duty is to reconcile themselves to the Church from which, contrary to the wishes of their founder, they have separated. They are told that if John Wesley could speak to them now, he would remind them "that Korah and his company, who were Levites, and invaded the Priest's office, were consumed by fire from God;" and lest any should console themselves with the idea that their ministry had been blessed of God, the Bishop warns them against so dangerous a delusion, by pointing them to the example of Balaam and Caiaphas, who "prophesied of Christ, and many have been edified by their prophecies; but, nevertheless, they who prophesied were objects of Divine wrath."

The plain speaking of the Bishop is admirable. It is infinitely better than the bland and honied accents in which Dissenters are sometimes assured of a friendship, which never takes any more practical and substantial form. It is extremely probable that many of his episcopal brethren will be annoyed at his imprudence, but he only tells us what he believes and what his Church teaches. Only, when he is on ground like this, he must not forget that he is in very slippery places, and he should not be too anxious to insist that "the Church of Rome is not merely teaching many great and grievous errors at variance with Holy Scripture, and with the doctrine of the ancient Catholic Church, but she

endeavours to impose those errors upon all men; and she will not hold communion with anyone who will not communicate with her in those unscriptural and anti-scriptural errors." For if the Bishop has a right to pronounce the Church of Rome, why may not Wesleyans pronounce him and his Church, in error; and if the Romish Church errs in imposing errors upon others, does not the English Church the same, when she refuses to recognise a society of Christian people as a Church because they have left her communion? The world will not bow before the golden idol of infallibility set up by Rome and Pius IX. It certainly will not humble itself before the inferior one, with its feet and toes of miry clay, which Dr. Wordsworth would have it honour.

The Bishop must have learned something of this in the Congress of the Old Catholics at Cologne. The experiences of that remarkable assembly must have been of the nature of a surprise, and in some respects a disagreeable surprise, to this decorous, respectable old Bishop, who is the very soul of amiable courtesy, but who unites with it a considerable amount of that dignity which, in this country at least, is always associated with the idea of a bishop. The Bishop is, as might be expected, an enemy of tobacco, and the extent to which the practice of smoking is carried by the free and easy Germans was doubtless as astonishing as it was offensive. On one occasion, at the house of one of the professors at Bonn, where some of the leaders

were assembled for grave discussion, the inevitable cigars were introduced. In due course they were handed to the Bishop, who put them aside with a gesture which could not be misunderstood. Although others present had helped themselves, such was the influence of the Bishop's example that no one ventured to use the obnoxious weed.

But if the German customs were distasteful to the Bishop, the Bishop's ideas, and even his bearing, could hardly have been more acceptable to the Germans. There was, according to the accounts of intelligent eye-witnesses, a very marked contrast between him and his companion, the Bishop of Ely (now of Winchester). The latter felt that the air of authority which an English prelate might assume in a Church Congress at home, and which even there is not always borne with patience, would be extremely out of place in such a great assembly, where he was present only as a guest, and he acted and spoke accordingly. Dr. Wordsworth, on the other hand, was possessed with the idea that he represented a great historic Church, which had had experiences closely resembling those of the Old Catholics, and that it was his place to instruct them as to their position and duties. The leaders of the movement were men of intellectual power at least equal to his own, and they understood their own position, with all its difficult and complicated problems, infinitely better. It could not have been pleasant for those able and learned men to be treated as a set of neophytes, even by an

English prelate. And yet the Bishop was not only perfectly unconscious of the offence against good taste and sound policy which he was committing, but would no doubt have been extremely surprised that anyone should object to his performance of what to him was an important duty. He rejoiced that they had rebelled against the Papacy, which in his view is Antichrist; and his anxiety was that they should preserve their true Catholicity by imitating as far as possible the example of the Anglican Church. It was simply another illustration of that marvellous faith in the claims of his Church which is characteristic of the good Bishop, and which would be extremely offensive if it were not for the personal amiability by which its harsher features are to some extent toned down. The Germans, however, did not recognise the force of his reasoning—do not seem to have been enamoured even by his ideal, and had sufficient knowledge to perceive the wide difference between that ideal and the actual Church of England.

Dr. Wordsworth, estimable, pious, and devoted as he undoubtedly is, is, in fact, a man of another generation. In the eighteenth century he would have made a model prelate, but despite his great learning, the service he has rendered to Biblical literature—which we should be the last to depreciate—and his implicit loyalty to his Church, it is questionable whether they who placed him on the Bench promoted either his own interests or those of the Church. He is actuated by the spirit of his

Church, the spirit of moderation, of compromise, and of exclusiveness. But for that very reason he is out of harmony with the age. The day of compromises is past, and the men who are seeking to maintain them have a hard struggle against the ardent partisans on both sides. They who contend for the Word of God alone "will, with God's help, be able to stand firm against the errors and arts of Romanism, and to defy the assaults of unbelief." But they who, with the Bishop, desire also to fortify themselves with "the sanction of Christian antiquity," forsake an impregnable position for one whose weaknesses they will learn by a bitter experience of disaster, difficulty, and defeat.

There are men who are overweening in their conceit, but in whom self-complacency is so innocent of all attempt at concealment, so perfectly natural and transparent, and so free also from any taint of envy, that it never wounds or irritates others. So is it with the Bishop of Lincoln's priestly arrogance. It is superb in its insolence towards Nonconformists of every grade, but it is so sincere, and at the same time so verdant in its simplicity, that it ought not to irritate even those who feel it necessary to resist its aggressions. No one who looks at the benevolent face of the old man can suspect him of any bitterness, even towards those whom he regards with a sort of pious abhorrence as schismatics, and there is no doubt he would be willing to show them any

personal courtesy which did not imply a recognition of their Christian character. But on this point he is firm, believing that he has a solemn duty to discharge, and that he must not shrink from it because of the misconstructions to which it may expose him from an unbelieving world and a scoffing generation.

He is an English Pio Nono, and, indeed, enables us better to understand his Holiness and make some allowance for his extraordinary manifestos. Of course Dr. Wordsworth would never indulge in such extravagant utterances as those by which the Pope has sometimes provoked the ridicule of all Europe, except the Ultramontanes. He is an Englishman, has lived in English society, and though confined to a limited circle, has felt to some extent the influence of English ideas, and strong as his ecclesiastical views may be, they have thus been modified and restrained. The marvel is, that these correcting forces have not told more upon him. They could hardly fail to preserve him from running to the same excess of absurdity as the Pope; but the extent to which the idea of episcopal and priestly prerogative is developed in him, would indicate that a monastic education, a lengthened enjoyment of the dignity of the Papacy, and an exposure to the atmosphere of the Curia, might have made him as impracticable and even as arrogant as the prisoner of the Vatican. The two men are alike in their personal amiability and their official assumption and obstinacy. Both

believe in the infallibility of the Church, and though they differ as to the organ of that infallibility, the pretensions of the one would be just as fatal to human liberty as those of the other. Alike they mourn over the degeneracy of the age, and believe themselves sent by God to rebuke and check its wickedness. Pio Nono has not a more sincere belief that the temporal power was a divine trust, which he cannot lightly abandon, than has Dr. Wordsworth that the churchyard is God's acre, which he, as a steward, is bound to guard against the desecrations of rebellious Nonconformists.

His writings, and especially his Commentary, furnish numerous illustrations of the character of the man, the simplicity being quite as remarkable as the intense sacerdotalism. The wisdom of enforcing the claims of his order in such a manner as to soften the opposition it is unable to disarm, seems never to occur to him. He is above all small considerations of expediency, and only thinks of setting forth his own view, regardless whom it may offend. He must surely look upon himself as a successor of the old prophets as well as a priest, for he lays down his principles and delivers his rebukes as one inspired of God, to show a generation of schismatics and Dissenters their sins. Thus, in speaking of Ananias and Sapphira, after classing their sin with that of Achan and describing it as sacrilege, he adds: "The substance of the comments above cited may be commended in connection with the awful history recorded in this chapter to the

consideration of those persons who have been or may be tempted to be guilty of a like sin by robbing God in '*tithes and offerings*.' (Malachi iii. 8), or in the matter of church-rates (see on Matt. xvii. 27)." After this attempt to identify opponents of tithes and church-rates with Achan and Ananias and Sapphira on the part of a learned Church dignitary, it is not very wonderful that the *Church Times* should describe the Protestant Dissenting Deputies as a "robbers' clique." The spirit of the Bishop, it must be said in justice, is very different from that of the journalist. There is nothing venomous or malignant in it. He writes rather as a faithful monitor, who may indeed inflict keen wounds, but does it in all conscientiousness, and with a simple desire to discharge his duty. In this particular case, Nonconformists may find some compensation in the fact that, in further commenting on the narrative, he supplies an indirect argument against the action of the clergy in the matter of the Burials Bill. "Why is it mentioned," he asks, "that Ananias and Sapphira were buried?" and one reason he assigns is, "To show that there was no feeling of personal vindictiveness on the part of the Apostles or the Church;" adding, "Primitive Christianity warred not with the dead; it wound up the bodies even of Ananias and Sapphira in a funeral sheet, and committed them to a decent grave." This is more than can be said of the Anglicanism which the Bishop represents in its treatment of Protestant Dissenters.

The sacraments are regarded by his lordship with a faith so strong and a veneration so intense, that he finds them everywhere. But, perhaps, the most curious example of this tendency is in his comments on the parable of the wedding garment, of which he says: "*The question, therefore, 'Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment?' may be understood as specially addressed to those who bear the Christian name, and who by virtue of certain articles of Christian belief that they hold, are so far members of the visible Church; but who reject the visible signs and means of spiritual grace which are provided for and prescribed to all by the Great King, viz. the Holy Sacraments. This interrogation, uttered by the King and Judge of all, has a solemn and awful reference to the Quakers and others who slight the sacramental symbols ordained by Christ Himself.*"

It is not clear whether the Bishop's idea is that the employment of the term "Friend" is meant to point directly to the excellent Christians who are thus addressed by each other. But it does not need such a suggestion to complete the intolerance of the passage. He, however, does not mean to be harsh or severe: it is only that he feels it his duty to rebuke the sins of a wayward generation, who do not own the authority of his Church, nor believe in a mystic grace resident in her sacraments. But it is not the intolerance which is so surprising to those who hold different views, as the encouragement which such a theory gives to the most

outward religious formalism. The Bishop is an eminently pious man: has he ever realised the consequences of telling men that the special rebuke of Christ is directed, not against those of unholy life, but against those who have not observed the sacraments? The Quakers, as a Society, are distinguished for truth, simplicity, purity, and goodness. Does Dr. Wordsworth mean to say that these all count for nothing if sacraments are neglected, even though neglected from a conscientious sense of duty to Christ, and that the believing and noble "Friend" will be cast into outer darkness, whereas the formalist who has observed sacraments will be admitted to the marriage supper of the Lamb? The doctrine, in its consequences, is simply immoral.

There is another evil resulting from this mode of speaking and acting. The Bishop himself is a man of kindly temper, and though it does not hinder him from asserting his ecclesiastical prerogatives, it preserves him, to some extent, from the arrogance they are calculated to engender. But it is not to be supposed that all the clergy will be like him in this respect. Many will be sure to press his views to the utmost, and in doing so, to show that insolence of pride which is in harmony with them. Thus a "Lincolnshire Clergyman," who has caught the ideas of his diocesan, endeavours to reconcile Dissenters to the inequality which the law creates, by telling them that equality is contrary to the order of nature and the will of God as shown

in it—which means, if it means anything, that God has ordained Episcopalians to honour and all other Christians to dishonour. How Christian unity can be maintained when such views prevail, it is not easy to see. But this may be owing to some defect of my own, for this gentleman informs us that no bishop has received more Dissenting ministers into holy orders. Remarkable, if true! If Dr. Wordsworth is successful with Dissenters, they ought certainly to be added to the immortal trio, the spaniel, the woman, and the walnut-tree, of whom it is said, "the more you beat them, the better they be." As a matter of fact, however, the Bishop of Lincoln is one of the best allies the Liberation Society has; and I, as one of its members, hope he may long live to conciliate Wesleyans by means of those inimitable pastorals, which might be irritating were they not so intensely amusing.

THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER.

MANCHESTER is one of the recently-created sees, and her Bishop one of the youngest prelates, yet there is no member of the Episcopal Bench who holds a more responsible position, or who is labouring with more energy and intelligence on behalf of the Establishment, than Dr. Fraser. It was a wise stroke of policy which made Manchester an episcopal city, and the selection of its present diocesan was hardly less fortunate. It is a mistake to suppose that Lancashire has ever been a strongly Liberal county, for at all times parties have been pretty evenly balanced, and the contentions between them have generally been keen and fierce. The rapid development of the manufacturing interest, however, seemed likely at one time to give the predominance to Dissent, and it was of the highest importance to the Church that she should lay her hands upon this new element. The creation of a Lancashire episcopate, independent altogether of its relation to the general work of the Church, was admirably calculated to accomplish this end. It

may be assumed that the experiment in Lancashire has been a success, as ardent Churchmen are so anxious to repeat it in Yorkshire. The appointment of a bishop must be supposed to add greatly to the spiritual power of the Church, but it is certain that it must add to the social status of the Establishment, and it is not uncharitable to assume that this is a point of which those who are so anxious for the extension of the episcopate do not lose sight. To have the Church represented by a man who necessarily must take the lead in the society of the district, is no slight gain among a class which is peculiarly covetous of social distinction; and there can be no question that the influence of a bishop tells very strongly in this direction. It is not often that the *nouveaux riches* are able to "my lord" their guests, and the rarity of the privilege causes it to be all the more prized. That the Church should be anxious to secure the goodwill of this plutocracy is not surprising, for it is among them that its political strength chiefly lies.

Of all the modes of winning them, few seem more effectual than to bring them into contact with bishops. There is a story, which I have every reason to believe true, that in the time of the late Bishop a young couple, both of them Dissenters and members of well-known Manchester Dissenting families, went to reside in the neighbourhood of his palace, and occasionally met him in society. An intimation, however, was given to them that he could not visit them, as their marriage had not been

sanctioned by the rites of the Church, and rather than forego this coveted privilege, they consented to be re-married in a London church. This is a very extreme case, but it exhibits in a strong form the advantage which resulted to the Establishment from the social position which the State gives to the Bishop, and is one of the innumerable incidental illustrations which are so abundant of the perfect religious equality which exists in this country. It may be said that the toadyism which is affected by such considerations cannot be of much use to any Church, and of course strong Dissenters are not open to these episcopal fascinations; but it would be foolish to ignore the existence of a large number of people, some of whom have many points of excellence, on whom these social influences tell to a far greater extent than sensible men would think possible, and the Church is wise in her generation in seeking to utilise them to the utmost.

If it be thought somewhat too absurd to suppose that Dissenters will be caught by the mere spectacle of lawn sleeves, and that to attribute the desire for the extension of the episcopate to any such feeling is to credit those who manifest it with extraordinary weakness, it should, at least, be remembered that Mr. Disraeli thinks that the advance of the Emperor of Russia may be checked by the simple plan of making the Queen Empress of India. If the master of a hundred legions is to be checked in this way, it is not impossible that Dissenters may be converted from the error of their

ways by sending a bishop into their districts. At all events, if Mr. Disraeli believes the one, Mr. Beresford Hope may believe the other. Indeed, it would be well for the former if he had as much reason for his confidence as the latter.

Lancashire men, too, are extremely susceptible to the attractions of superior intellect and culture. In no part of the country is a scholar more likely to receive the consideration due to his attainments, and a bishop bringing with him a certain literary repute has a sure passport to influence. This was one recommendation which Dr. Lee, the first bishop, was supposed to possess, and it told in his favour. But though he undoubtedly did the Church good service, more perhaps in the earlier than in the later years of his episcopate, his was not a happy appointment. He had been a head-master before he went to Manchester, and a schoolmaster, in temper, style, and character, he remained to the end of his days. There was not an approach to religious earnestness in his spirit or work; and though he might have been a fair specimen of a State official, a very fit head for a body of men who, without any particular dogma to teach, were appointed to act as ministers of the State religion in their respective parishes after the most approved Erastian idea, as a Christian prelate he was rather out of his sphere. In his relations to his clergy he was a martinet, reserving his geniality for those of the laity, Churchmen or Dissenters, whom he thought it desirable to influence. On more earnest

and thoughtful men he did not leave a happy impression; but there was a certain class who were loud in their praises of his affability, his readiness to help in works from which the clergy had hitherto stood aloof, and his general liberality. The last-named quality, indeed, was found by many, on fuller experience, to consist in professions rather than deeds, or at most to be extremely superficial. He was, in fact, a Whig, and had all the characteristics of the party. He was cold, inclined to hauteur, without a spark of enthusiasm, and with a great show of breadth and liberality, which produced very little practical result. Still, whatever were his drawbacks, he augmented the influence and contributed to the progress of the Church, and so far justified the policy which made the metropolis of the cotton districts into an episcopal see.

But it is since Dr. Fraser's appointment that its wisdom has been fully manifest. Mr. Gladstone has seldom done a better thing for the Church than in appointing such a man to such a position. In one of the more sleepy episcopal cities, with all their old traditions, their conventional dignity, their dread of novelty, the Bishop of Manchester would have been wholly out of place, and might have done as much mischief as good. But the qualities which would have astonished and probably alarmed many of these old-fashioned Churchmen, are just those which recommend him to the men of the North. Even Lancashire Toryism is not the stagnant, inert, lifeless kind of thing to be found in Dorset-

shire or Huntingdon. It is strong in its prejudices, fierce in its antagonisms, reckless and violent in many of its words and deeds; it prides itself on its devoted attachment to the "glorious constitution;" but with all the ardour of its loyalty to its party, and its enthusiasm for all its symbols and watch-words, there is little of the stolidity of Conservatism about it. It shares in the spirit, daring, energy, and love of progress characteristic of the district, and so it can respect these qualities as they are developed by the Bishop, even though it may not approve of all their manifestations. On the other hand, it stands in peculiar need of that moderating influence which a man of culture, accustomed to take broad views of principles and parties, is able to supply. It carries into its warfare a strong, almost passionate, hate of Dissent and Dissenters, very different from the more contemptuous spirit which prevails in regions where the Church is more predominant and the rivalry of Nonconformists less formidable, and therefore less irritating.

It is fair to Dr. Fraser to say that he supplies the restraining as well as the stimulating power, and that while he is full of zeal in defence of the Church and untiring in his labours on her behalf—a very model, in fact, of episcopal devotedness and diligence, on the other hand he is most anxious to deal fairly with opponents, and does his best to repress that fierceness which has been too characteristic of the party of which he is the natural head in the diocese. How far he has succeeded in this

last point will appear afterwards; of the effect of his marvellous activity there can be no question. In the closing years of Dr. Lee's life, the power of the Bishop had hardly been felt at all; and there was an earnest longing on the part of Churchmen generally for a more efficient administration. The coming of Dr. Fraser was the introduction of new and vigorous life, much fuller and more intense than many expected or desired. He has an insatiate appetite for work, and wherever duty calls or opportunity invites he is to be found. With the old notion of episcopal dignity he has no sympathy. He feels that he has a work, and, regardless of the conventionalisms of his Church, he sets himself to do it in such methods as seem most likely to ensure success. He leaves no part of his diocese unvisited, nor is there any class of its people to whom he does not more or less directly appeal. He takes up every variety of social, ecclesiastical, and educational subjects, and discourses upon all of them, from the pulpit or the platform, always with fluency and considerable sagacity, and often with effect. He is foremost in all the movements of general philanthropy, and cheerfully responds to every appeal for service. In short, neither by taste nor temperament is he disposed to a life of ease, and, seeing that the interests of the Church require that a bishop in such a diocese should be abundant in labours, he cheerfully addresses himself to the work. His restless activity is certainly not without its drawbacks.

Perhaps there is about most of his deliverances too much of the tone of the "superior person." They give the idea of a man who feels that he is set for the illumination of a benighted class among whom he dwells, and have an air of oracular authority which is not always agreeable. There is a good deal of force, manliness, and independence about his speaking; but he never seems to forget that he is a bishop, and speaks from an elevation no one else can occupy, and with a semi-oracular authority which ought not to be lightly challenged. Very probably he is not himself so conscious of this as his hearers and readers are, and for it the system rather than the man ought to be held responsible. The State has placed him in Lancashire for the enlightenment and elevation of Lancashire. He is the chief of the hundreds of educated gentlemen whom it has so benevolently located there, for the purpose of guiding the minds and improving the character and condition of the people; and he would be untrue to his own ideal of the high office which he fills, if he did not address them as one who has a special right to be heard.

But if the tacit assumption of authority which underlies most of his utterances be the result of the system, the Bishop has committed other faults which are his own. It requires extreme care in one who speaks often and on topics so diverse, to steer clear of inaccurate statements, and of this, unfortunately for his own reputation, he is not sufficiently mindful. The correspondence columns

of the Manchester newspapers would furnish a large number of illustrations of the Bishop's rashness and inaccuracy. He is a man of intense convictions, warm feelings, and strong impulses; and, like all men of his type, is too ready to accept statements which fall in with his own notions without sufficiently testing them, and then by giving them to the world with the added weight of his own name and position, to provoke controversy and involve himself in difficulty. Of the good faith with which he has often made assertions which have afterwards been disproved, no one doubts; but even his friends must regret that, with his courage and frankness there is not united a little more caution. Perhaps there is a certain chivalry even about his imprudence; but a bishop, and especially one dwelling in so heated an atmosphere of party feeling as that which Dr. Fraser breathes, should certainly be able to sift the exaggerated assertions of excited partisans, and separate the modicum of truth which may be in them, before quoting them as statements of positive fact, and proceeding to argue from them. Had he done this, he might have saved himself from many a mortification. At one time, indeed (experience may have taught him to be more guarded, though it has not corrected all his faults), there was hardly a great speech which he made that was not followed by a newspaper controversy, in the course of which it was tolerably sure that the Bishop would have to make some retractations.

It would be invidious to insist too strongly on cases of this character, but one may be quoted as an illustration of many. It has relation to one of the Bishop's favourite themes—education. Let it be said, at the outset, that he is no bigot, and is far from sharing the heated feelings of the extreme men of his party. At times it has appeared as if he were more in sympathy with Nonconformists than with their opponents; but, though he ventured to say some manly words on behalf of the League at the York Convocation, and to tell his brethren that if their professed zeal for religious education was all real, there was no reason for the excessive alarm about the League's proposals, he has been a decided supporter of religious education, and has again and again, both in sermon and speech, insisted on its necessity. Why he should, on this account, entertain any jealousy of school-boards is not very obvious; but, strange to say, though the majority of the school-boards are pledged to a system of religious education, and have shown themselves willing enough to redeem their pledge, they could hardly find less favour in the eyes of the clerical party and its organ, the National Education Union, if they had consisted of Atheists and Secularists, and were determined on having only secular teaching in their schools.

The Bishop, of course, never talked of them as some of his brethren do. He is too candid, too courteous, in every respect too much of a Christian and a gentleman for that. But at first he

certainly did not like them. This was shown in a sermon preached at Bolton, on Sunday, October 1st, 1871, in which he discoursed on free schools, the compulsory clauses, and the necessity for a religious element in national education *cum quibusdam aliis*, and proved his inability to apprehend what is really demanded in the interests of religious equality, or, indeed, to appreciate properly the scruples of different consciences, by proposing as a basis of common Christianity, "the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments as explaining our duty to God and our neighbour, then our Catechism and the Lord's Prayer," which he thought "would be a basis sufficiently broad to comprehend all Protestant and orthodox Christians." Why those who are not Protestants or not orthodox, or not Christians at all, should be passed over in a national system does not appear; but it is strange to find a man so liberal as the Bishop so ignorant of the real points of difference and difficulty as to suppose that even the "Catechism" might be accepted as part of the teaching of a common Christianity.

But the sermon demands notice mainly because of one of his rash statements about school-boards which it contains. "He found everywhere lamentations that the school-boards were formed, that money was raised and spent, and that yet, for some cause, hardly a child had been sent to school. A member of the Oldham School-Board said to him the other day, with a feeling almost of shame in his face, 'We have been sitting and talking nine or

ten months, and have raised and nearly spent £800, and yet have not got a single child to school.'" Here is an example of some of the Bishop's worst faults. If there was a member of the "stupid party" foolish enough to talk to him in this style, even though he was a member of a school-board, the Bishop should have shown him the utter unreasonableness of his complaint, even supposing what he said had been strictly true. The foundations of a new and complicated system are not laid in a day. School-boards had bye-laws to prepare and to submit for the sanction of the Education Department, statistical inquiries to institute, and all kind of preliminaries to attend to, and nine months was not a long time for this work. But the Bishop, instead of pointing out all this to his less intelligent informant, falls into his humour, shares his prejudices, accepts his statement, and in the pulpit of the Bolton parish church, holds up the Oldham-School Board as a melancholy example of extravagance and inefficiency for having spent nearly £800, and not sent a single child to school. And then, after all, it turned out that the facts were not so. The Board had not spent more than £200; and though it had not directly forced any children into school, and could not, until it obtained the compulsory powers for which it had asked, it had, as a matter of fact, induced a large number of children to attend the school, and, with its Dissenting chairman, was working with as much energy and success as any Board in the country. Everybody knows the class

of man to which the Bishop's informant belonged, a class who are always complaining of all work over which they have not themselves supreme control. The reckless assertions of a narrow bigot of his type could surprise no one. The only cause of astonishment is that a bishop should give them currency in a sermon, and that this should not be at all a solitary or even a rare example of such indiscretions. It is to be added to his credit that when the Chairman of the Board called his attention to the facts, he was prompt and full in his acknowledgments of error. So, indeed, he always is; but then such retractations cannot undo the effects of the original mistake, still less can they remove the injurious results to the Bishop's reputation.

The Bishop, of course, was prominent during the education controversy, but it may be doubted whether his advocacy was altogether acceptable to his Church friends. The promoters of the Manchester demonstration in 1873 probably thought they had achieved a great success in securing him as its chairman, but it may be doubted whether they were as well satisfied, either with him or themselves, at the close of the meeting as at the commencement. He found so little that was congenial in the atmosphere of Lancashire Toryism that he had twice to rebuke his audience—once for a stupid laugh at the idea that a Liberal paper could give a fair report, and again because they thought it necessary to give one of their groans at the mention of Mr. Miall's name. Dr. Fraser is a

Christian gentleman, who treats others with the candour and courtesy he expects to receive himself; and he has no sympathy with the insensate bigotry which howls down the arguments it cannot answer, and thinks itself warranted to regard all who will not accept its opinions as fools or villains. Dr. Fraser can hold his own—no man better; but he is ready to see and concede the strong points of an adversary. If a spirit like his ruled in the councils of the Anglican Church a compromise would have been not only practicable but easy, but while Tories are glad enough to avail themselves of the influence of his name and eloquence, his conciliatory utterances are treated with disregard.

Still it is amazing how loosely even so sensible a man can talk, especially as to the rights of conscience, in this matter of education. When he said that "anti-vaccinators have just as conscientious objections to the medical officers being paid out of the rate, for infusing what they deem poisonous lymph into the blood of children, as a ratepayer can possibly have to denominational schools," he not only argued in a style unworthy of himself, but he supplied his opponents with a ready and complete answer. "We must," he went on, "regulate these scrupulous consciences, if we happen to be troubled with them, a little in matters of national concern." Surely he must have forgotten that the grand argument for the 25th clause is that derived from these scrupulous consciences, which are to override all considerations of national policy

and common justice, and to insist on the State providing the means for meeting their demands. His argument is at least as valid when applied to parents who, having hitherto neglected the education of their children entirely, assert now that a deadly wrong will be done to their consciences if the State does not, besides providing them with the means of secular education, send them where they can be instructed in a creed to which they have never given a solitary sign of attachment before they raised this extraordinary scruple, as when addressed to honest and industrious ratepayers who, having a clear view of the distinction between truth and error, object to pay for the teaching of error. It is useless, however, to go over this ground again. The argument is exhausted, and if men are content to assert and deny the rights of conscience in the same breath, if they will be contemptuous of consciences which protest against being forced to support a religious teaching they disapprove, and indulgent only to such as demand that they shall have the right to coerce others, the only plan is to wait for the return of a sounder state of feeling.

The question, however, has a much wider range than is included by this endless and not very profitable discussion about the comparative rights of the conscience of the ratepayer and the parent. It is a question of the relative value of denominational and national schools; and the Bishop, though speaking on the platform of the Union, has a very clear perception that there is much to be said in favour of

the scheme advocated by the League. The objection of Nonconformists to the present system is not only that the consciences of some are violated, but that the great interests of education are sacrificed for sectarian ends, and that a work in which the energies of the entire nation and of all classes in it ought to be combined, is made the occasion of bitter controversy and strife. They complain of injustice done to them, but they complain still more of the hindrances that have been interposed in the way of national education. The Bishop was unjust to them when, in order to reduce the controversy to a mere sectarian strife, he laid hold of a sentence quoted from the *Economist* by the *Saturday Review*, that "Dissenters very naturally hoped that the Education Act would do a great deal to destroy the caste advantages which the Church enjoys in this country," and that its failure to accomplish it is "a fair cause of disappointment to the Dissenters." The statement of the *Economist* is that of a candid Liberal politician, not of a Nonconformist, and its mode of putting the case is hardly that which Nonconformists would adopt, and still less would they assent to the paraphrase of it by the *Saturday*, which, with an utter disregard of truth and fairness (that, however, is not peculiar to it), says: "What they want is not a national system of education, free, unbiassed, and efficient, but a system of education which shall supply the means of weakening and fettering the Church of England, and of placing it at a disadvantage as compared with other

religious bodies." The *Saturday* should know that the thing which it says they do not want is the one thing for which they are working, that they have neither desire nor expectation of getting sectarian advantage out of any system, and that the only restraint they would put upon the Church of England is to prevent her from obtaining exclusive benefits they would repudiate for themselves. They desire simply that, in the matter of education, the State should recognise no sects, but should treat all its subjects as standing precisely on the same level, and know them only as citizens. It might have been hoped that the Bishop of Manchester would have admitted this, but he forgot himself, and stooped to the level of his audience, when he suggested that the "painless extinction" of the Anglican Church was what Dissenters expected from the Education Act. His devotion to his own system does sometimes render him unconsciously unfair to Nonconformists.

Still, with these drawbacks, there are few bishops on the Bench—it would be hard to name another—so free, so genial, so indifferent to the pomps and gewgaws of office, with so little of the mere cleric and so much of the true man, as Dr. Fraser. Whatever mistakes he may commit, there is a reality about him which commands respect; and widely as men may differ from him, they must feel that he is a true man, intent on working out his own idea of the right. He, at least, does not suffer from that fatty degeneracy of heart which he lately described as

one of the diseases of the day. Instead of reserving himself for great occasions, he is as ready, perhaps more ready, to preach in the poorest village church in his diocese, than to the fashionable and influential congregations in its great towns. Nor does he confine his preaching to churches, but will meet working-men on their own ground, in informal gatherings of their class, in an unoccupied factory or a workyard, and address them on the topics of every-day life, with a simplicity, freedom, and frankness which cannot fail to attract. It is true that in these addresses he may be too exclusively the common-sense philosopher, and that there is but little to remind his hearers of the more sacred character he has to sustain, and the more important message that he has to deliver. But while it may well be desired that in his addresses there should be something of a more distinctively religious tone, it cannot be denied that most of his lessons are eminently useful, and that the whole bearing of the man secures him the sympathy of all who can appreciate intellectual power and moral worth. Men may wish that he was less impulsive, less oracular in his tone, not so ready to assert his own judgment on all kinds of subjects, and among them many with which he can have but little acquaintance, more conscious that omniscience is not the gift of any man, not even a bishop, and above all, more slow to receive the statements of men of no authority and endorse them. But, nevertheless, they respect him for his independence, his force

of character, his practical temper, and his desire to be useful.

He has, no doubt, an idea of making crooked things straight, which sometimes brings him into awkward positions. Thus, in some of his attempts to reform the Sunday-school system, the want of a fuller insight into Lancashire character had nearly involved him in considérable difficulty and personal obloquy, for though there are points which require correction, and which strike an outsider more than those who have grown up in familiarity with them, yet a stranger, though he may be more skilful in the diagnosis of the disease, is pretty sure to err in its treatment from an inability to understand local feelings and associations. So the Bishop has found on more than one occasion. But if Lancashire men are not readily brought to defer to the superior wisdom of an outsider, however elevated his rank, teaching them how to manage their own institutions, they can respect integrity of motive, and Dr. Fraser has, on the whole, earned as high a reputation among them as any bishop would be likely to gain—much higher than would be enjoyed by one who was more of the priest or ecclesiastic.

It would be better for the Bishop and his Church if he trusted to his personal influence and work for strengthening the power of the Establishment, instead of descending into the arena of controversy and being so anxious to answer every possible attack. Dissenters, of course, cannot and would not

object to have bishops opposed to them as defenders of the Church; on the contrary, they would rather welcome it. It is much pleasanter to contend with Dr. Fraser, or indeed with any bishop who will seriously address himself to the work and meet us on a fair field of argument, than with Dr. Massingham, Dr. Potter, Mr. Berger, or others of the same class, who may irritate Dissenters, but will never do any real service to their own Church. In the first place, the Bishop is worthy of any foeman's steel, and in conquering him there is a real advantage to be gained, which is a great deal more than can be said for the loud talkers who think that to rail against Dissenters is to prove the righteousness and necessity of a National Church, who indulge in quibbles or in wholesale slanders rather than in arguments, whom it is difficult to fasten at any point, and whose defeat in any case would tell nothing either on one side or the other. The controversy, therefore, when a combatant like the Bishop is engaged, assumes an entirely new character, and one which to us is much more satisfactory. Whether it is as much for the interests of the Church that her prelates should thus admit that her right is a point to be argued, that hers can no longer be regarded as an undisputed position, and that they are bound in honour and by the necessities of the case to come forth as her champions, is a question with which Nonconformists will not concern themselves. They rather accept the fact that the defence is undertaken by the

bishops as an unconscious confession of the growing force of Nonconformity.

The organs of the Establishment point to Dr. Fraser's Charge as one of the most able and successful appeals ever made in its defence, and in some respects it is entitled to this eulogy. Yet there is considerable weakness about it, and in nothing more than in the extreme sensitiveness he shows to Nonconformist criticisms. If it suited the purpose of the Bishop to compile a number of strong statements against the Church from the speeches or writings of Dissenters, it is no doubt his own business; but unless he was prepared to show that there was in them some element of special malignity or unfairness, he injured only his own cause by such a course. It might have been good policy to complain that a Dissenter had said that children were gathered into Church schools to be taught that "all Dissenters shall die the death of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram," if this had been a palpable misrepresentation; but when my lamented friend Mr. Parkinson was able to justify his statements by a considerable array of facts, it is hard to see what the Bishop gained by calling attention to such a display of bigotry. Or if the Anglican Church was offering such uncompromising opposition to Romanism that it was a shameless slander to assert that it was the highway to Rome, the Bishop might well have quoted it as a proof of the blinding influences of prejudice of Dissenters; but it is not so clear why he should adduce it at all,

when there are so many, even in the Church itself, who can only say, "'Tis true 'tis pity, and pity 'tis 'tis true."

But the morbid sensitiveness to criticism which was shown in this strange catena of Dissenting utterances, is eminently characteristic of the Bishop. It may seem at first a sign of doubt and uncertainty on his own part, a secret and unconfessed suspicion that the Church is not so unassailable as he would fain believe, and a consequent impatience of the attacks to which she is exposed. But it would be unwise and unjust to adopt too hastily this idea. The explanation of his strong feeling is to be sought rather in the profound conviction of the supreme excellence of the Establishment and an inability to appreciate the position of Dissenters, which leads him to mistake their aim and spirit. He is so far liberal that he recognises the good there is in those who differ from him, and shows himself most anxious to do justice to their position and arguments; and if he does not succeed, it is because his own view is so vividly present to his mind that he is unable to see the other side of the subject. His desire to think kindly thoughts and speak kindly words of Dissenters has often astonished and scandalised more bigoted Churchmen, who had not been accustomed to suppose that any good thing could come out of Dissent, or that there should be any dealings between them as the true Israel and the Samaritans. At the opening of a church in a town where, as in most other parts of his diocese,

party feeling runs very high, he told the congregation—much to the disgust of the class whose greatest satisfaction in the erection of a new church is that it will be another instrument for putting down Dissent—that he was delighted to hear that among the contributors to the funds were several Nonconformists, and he only hoped that, when the next Nonconformist chapel was built in the town, Churchmen would reciprocate this manifestation of Christian liberality. This certainly would not be thought good Churchism by a large party of Lancashire Churchmen, who would find it hard to believe that the Bishop is just as strong a Churchman as they are themselves, though his attachment may rest on different grounds and show itself in a different way. It should be said to his honour that he has made it his business to rebuke this intolerance in his own friends, and has not cared for the personal odium he has thus incurred; and no doubt the consciousness of his own integrity of purpose in this respect has made him feel more what he regards as the uncharitableness of Dissenters.

To him and his school they are a puzzle and annoyance. He wishes to be friendly, and so do Nonconformists. They are quite as ready to honour Churchmen for loyalty to their ideas of truth as they are to claim respect for their own, and they certainly would not shrink from any co-operation in Christian service for which their friends are prepared. What is so strange to Broad Churchmen is, that with all these catholic sentiments and

charitable professions Dissenters are not as prepared to abstain from action against the Establishment as they are willing to cease from hard words against Nonconformity; and this is felt the most by the Erastian party, who, having no strong dogmatic prepossessions themselves, have no sympathy with the intense feelings of men who believe that the present condition of the Established Church is a scandal and a hindrance to Christian truth. They forget that the two parties are not on an equal footing. There is a great national institution, from which Dissenters are not only excluded, but which they conscientiously believe to be injurious both to Church and State. The silence, therefore, which is easy enough to Broad Churchmen, which would in fact be a gain to their cause, is impossible to their opponents. It is consistent both with the principles and policy of Erastians that they should wish to keep things as they are; but Dissenters, believing them to be wrong, must labour for change. The silence valued by the party in possession cannot be observed by those who believe their exclusion to be an act of injustice. There must necessarily be, therefore, conflict of opinion, and all that either party can do is to guard against all bitterness, and not allow differences of opinion to create alienation of feeling. It is only to be regretted that the Bishop can do so little to moderate the bigotry of his own friends: they accept his advocacy, but neither like nor imitate his liberality.

The Bishop's is, as might be expected, an optimist

view of the Establishment. Seldom has it been presented in so attractive an aspect as in the picture drawn in his Charge. But it is a fancy picture. The "modest maintenance" provided for its ministers, "independent of the petulances of deacons, or the whims of congregations," is so insufficient in hundreds of cases, that one of our Princesses is using her name and influence to raise a fund to secure a necessary living for men who have hardly a better provision than the "able preachers" sent forth by Mr. Spurgeon, to whom the Bishop points as a discredit to Voluntaryism. The "definite yet simple creed," which the Church professes, includes that Athanasian Creed, against whose enforced use the Bishop himself argued with such effect in the Convocation Chamber at York, and which in this Charge he calls a "perplexing document." The Gospel which she preaches, and which "awakens in grovelling humanity aspirations after a higher life," it would be difficult to define, for it differs in different parishes, and that which the Rector of A declares to be the truth of God, is pronounced by his neighbour to be soul-destroying error. The Church "which rejoices in every extension of her Master's kingdom, and can hold the right hand of fellowship to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity," is the Church which looks jealously on the conversion of Madagascar, and whose clergy tell the ignorant people there that the men at whose hands they have received the Gospel are unauthorised pretenders

who have no right to teach at all; and though we are told "she no longer warns other labourers in this vast field off her premises as though they were trespassers," we know that her clergy claim all the souls in the country as their cure, and, wherever it is possible, act accordingly. In short, this picture represents the Church as the Bishop would have it, not as it is, and not as there is any prospect of making it. Were it even conformed to his ideal, Nonconformists would still, in their own view, have just grounds of objection to the violation of religious equality in the special advantages given by the State to one class of religionists. But this is what the Bishop, with all his liberality, cannot see. "If people are free to worship when and where they please, if the rights of all denominations are equally protected by an impartial administration of the law, she (the Church) thinks that the claims of religious equality—not as an abstract theory or a vague general sentiment, but as a practical fact such as those with which alone statesmen care to deal—are satisfied." The Erastian is just as far from understanding the rights of conscience in others as the highest Anglican. He represents a powerful and privileged Church, and if Nonconformists are tolerated, does not see what right they can have to object to the predominance which he enjoys.

The Bishop is to be classed among the Broad Church party, not so much because of his theological views—for he must be a keen-sighted man who is able to discover what they are—as

because of his adherence to the Latitudinarian idea of the Church. He is not content, indeed, that this latitude should be so abused as to cover the excesses of Ritualism, of which he speaks in very strong and emphatic terms, which are all the more telling as coming from one of his liberal views. He says that its "practices, intolerable even in days of feebler light, are now a pure and simple anachronism;" that they "savour, many of them, of an abject and almost meaningless superstition;" that they "seem to me most unhappy, most disloyal, most disastrous." As may be supposed, he is no favourite with the Anglican party, and indeed his sermon at the Nottingham Congress gave such offence to a large body of the clergy of different sections, that it is said the Bishop of Derry preached a discourse for the purpose of counteracting its mischievous tendencies. Nevertheless, there are few men who are at present doing more to strengthen the Anglican Church than Dr. Fraser, but he is doing it not in virtue of his Erastianism, or of that careful endeavour to adjust the claims of all parties, which lead many to esteem him a "Trimmer," nor even by his zealous opposition to the demands of Dissenters, but by the catholic spirit and the abundant labours by which he wins respect for himself and his office, and to some extent for the Church which he so vigorously defends, but of which many of her fierce zealots would say he is an unworthy and unfaithful son.

Nowhere is he more likely to be so misjudged than

in his own diocese, where the severity of the conflict which the Establishment has to maintain against a powerful and determined Nonconformity is apt to engender a partisan temper, which cannot brook the restraint which the Bishop would put on its violence. The *Manchester Courier*, the organ of the fierce Toryism of the district, is continually at war with him, its intense zeal for the Church manifesting itself in the unnecessary and not always very scrupulous criticism of the Prelate, to whom, on its own principles, it owes deference and respect. Happily for Dr. Fraser, he has a coadjutor of a very different theological bias from himself, but of a similar temper, in the Dean. Dr. Cowie is well known as an advanced Churchman, but his Essay on "Toleration"—written, however, before he was promoted to the Deanery, and had been exposed to the narrowing influences of Manchester Churchmanship—deals with the question of Disestablishment perhaps in a more liberal spirit than any clergyman has shown. There he does not hesitate to admit that "Church Establishment is certainly inconsistent with religious equality. There are positions maintained by law which are accessible to Church clergy only. *These imply a religious inequality.*" It is a large concession, and is possibly further than the Bishop would go, but it shows that in his own endeavours to meet Nonconformists in a candid and courteous spirit, he will have the sympathy of the Dean. It would not be too much to say that the two principal Church dignitaries in the Manchester

diocese, the two men, that is, who would have most to lose by Disestablishment, and who certainly from their position and culture are able to take the broadest view of the subject, are the most liberal men in the whole host of Church defenders.

It was on this account that they found themselves exposed to attack from the Tory paper on the morning after the great demonstration in favour of Disestablishment at the Free Trade Hall in November last. The speakers had paid a tribute of respect to the spirit manifested both by the Bishop and the Dean. It ought surely to have been regarded as a sign of progress, that in a controversy so exciting, the opposing parties were able to preserve their temper, to guard against the intrusion of any personal feelings, and to discuss the question in the spirit most likely to promote a friendly understanding, despite all differences of opinion. The advocates of Disestablishment neither meant, on the one hand, to pay empty compliments, nor, on the other, to insinuate that Dr. Fraser or Dr. Cowie sympathised with them, but simply to recognise the fact that they were honest opponents, who spoke and acted as Christian gentlemen. There really was nothing in the simple words which were spoken to excite any ire on the part of the champions of the Establishment. I was myself one of the transgressors, but I was so free from any intention to offend, that I was weak enough to fancy that this honest recognition of qualities which I respected in an opponent might help to smooth the necessary

asperities of controversy. It was the desire of my friend and myself to divest our reasonings of everything which might imply that our opposition to the Establishment meant antagonism to the clergy; and if, in seeking to secure this, we were too lavish in the honour we paid to those who seemed worthy of honour, we erred in innocence and good faith. But the very idea that a bishop and a dean could be praised by Nonconformist agitators, was as gall and wormwood to the Tory journalist; and so what was meant for good was, quite undesignedly on our part, the means of exposing both these gentlemen to a severe attack. Instead of accepting the favourable expressions of opponents as one of the highest tributes that could be paid to their chief pastors, these Manchester Tories could only rejoice that, in no other diocese could Liberation speakers have spoken of a bishop and a dean in such language. They might not be so loud in their complaints if they could only understand that while Nonconformist speakers do not expect to find sympathisers in Church dignitaries, they are always ready to acknowledge and to admire ability and courtesy in their most determined opponents. But this is what Manchester Toryism seems unable to perceive, and it therefore assails its high-minded Bishop.

There is only this consolation for those whose mistake exposed Dr. Fraser to such unfair reflections. He is so accustomed to these attacks, that they must long since have lost any power to wound him. His conduct has always been that of a man

who is superior to the seductions of popularity, and is prepared to assert his own views of truth and right at whatever cost of personal reputation. Whether he incenses the agricultural interest by the startling inquiry, "Are the farmers mad?" or provokes the opposition of his own Synod by pleading in favour of a compromise on the Burials Bill among men whose watchword everywhere and at all times is "No surrender;" or calls forth the depreciatory remarks of the large classes whom he annoys by his condemnation of fashionable follies or commercial frauds; or disappoints the champions of sectarian education by insisting that it is better that school-boards should do the work than that it should be done inefficiently;—the fearless spirit of the man and his love of righteousness are always to be commended. If the State should think it desirable to have in every county a representative possessed of high intellectual and moral qualities, who might introduce into it an element of "sweet reasonableness," influence public opinion, and lead public movements, Dr. Fraser would be eminently fitted for such a position. Whether he is equally qualified to be the organ of a Christian Church with a definite theology, is a question about which there would be great difference of opinion.

THE BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

THE diocese of Carlisle seems in some respects to be a kind of outlying dependency of the Establishment, where Episcopacy is not quite at home, and must have hard work to maintain its ground at all. Durham, indeed, is almost as distant from the centre, but there is an ecclesiastical tone and character about Durham that does not belong to the sister city, which is almost as much Scotch as English, and might be thought to have stronger affinities with the Presbyterianism of the north than with the more æsthetic and hierarchical Episcopalianism of the south. The very difference in the cathedrals is typical of the contrast in spirit between the two cities. That of Durham is one of our finest specimens of ecclesiastical architecture, and the grand old building must be felt by all observers to be in every way fitted for a great diocesan church. But Carlisle, on the contrary, impresses us as little as any of our cathedrals. The Bishop, who was transferred from the Deanery of

Ely to his present office, says: "It has been my lot to be officially connected with two cathedrals which, in point of grandeur, stand almost at the extremes of the English list;" and though he is anxious not to "speak disrespectfully" of the seat of his own episcopate, all that he can say is, "Carlisle is an unfortunate cathedral rather than a poor one; if the whole building were completed in accordance with the eastern portion, if we could fancy a nave of twelve bays built in the architecture of the choir, and a lofty spire thrown up from a grand central tower, few cathedrals would be finer; but, unhappily, the apparent intention of rebuilding the whole structure, if it was ever entertained, was never carried out; and to make bad worse, the old Norman nave was destroyed in the Civil War, with the exception of a small portion; and the result is, that we have an incomplete and inconsistent building, which tempts one to speculate whether the zeal and the money which are now supplying a nave at Bristol will ever come so far north as Carlisle, and do a similar work there." In these days of ecclesiastical development it is impossible to say what may not be done, but if the Bishop's fancies are ever to become realities, both zeal and money, we imagine, will have to come from the south. At least, we can hardly conceive of Carlisle or the region round taking up such a work with any great interest or liberality.

It is fortunate for the Establishment that most of its principal representatives in the diocese of late

years have been Evangelical in their teaching. The present Dean is well known as a stout and sturdy champion of Evangelicalism, whose strength and weakness are alike developed so fully in him. If he had stood alone we may be sure that he would have firmly maintained the position of his own school. He would not even have been tempted into such weakness as that which is provoking the censures of certain Evangelicals on the excellent Dean of Chester, who has yielded to the majority of the Chapter, and allowed the use of Hymns Ancient and Modern in the nave services. But, till the advent of Dr. Harvey Goodwin, he was in perfect accord with his Bishop. The last two occupants of the see, Villiers and Waldegrave, were Evangelicals of the purest water, and on that account admirably fitted to do the special work required in the diocese. A man of another type, one with the principles and aims of Dr. Moberly and the late Dr. Hamilton, who have given such a High Church complexion to the diocese of Salisbury, or even one with more capacity of adopting his own exalted ideas of priestly prerogative to the necessities of time and place, like Dr. Mackarness at Oxford, or Dr. Durnford at Chichester, would have set the whole district in a blaze, and certainly have contributed to the growth of Dissent. Hitherto, Ritualism has not found congenial soil in the northern province at all, and the Carlisle diocese is, if possible, less adapted to it than any other. Its present

Bishop, however, is more disposed to accord to it a certain measure of tolerance than any of his right reverend brethren in the north. It would be hard to say how far he is in actual sympathy with it, but in a body including the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham and Ripon, it is quite possible for a prelate to be more considerate of the feelings of Ritualists than his neighbours, without having any positive leaning of his own towards their practices. Dr. Harvey Goodwin probably has as little liking for the more offensive extravagances of the Romanising school as Dr. Baring himself, and it is quite possible that if he had to deal with some of their extreme forms, he would show quite as much firmness and resolution as Dr. Bickersteth. But if his doctrines have a flavour of mild Evangelicalism, he is himself a very decided ecclesiastic, and he has during the greater part of his life breathed an atmosphere calculated to foster the growth of priestly feeling. He has lived almost entirely in regions which are rarely, if ever, penetrated by popular feeling. The Church has, to a very large extent, been his world, and his opinions and sympathies have been moulded accordingly. His work as a dean was done *con amore*, and the spirit with which he threw himself into it was such as would lead him to look tenderly upon all æsthetic changes in worship. "I think," he says, "that we may very well admit that the side of religion which is concerned with worship is the weakest side both of the Church of England and of other Protestant Churches. The feeling of the necessity of

sound Christian teaching is strong, the feeling of the need of prayer is strong, but the highest feeling of all, the feeling of the noble nature of worship—worship which will approximate to that which John witnessed in his vision as occupying the inhabitants of heaven—this feeling is certainly not so strong as it ought to be, not so strong perhaps as it was in the olden days, when it may fairly be granted that the Church was much darker than it is now." This is certainly taking very strong ground. It involves, in fact, the acceptance of the fundamental principle of the Ritualistic argument. The Apocalypse supplies, in the view of the party, the true ideal of Christian worship, and if that point is to be conceded to them, they have got an important base of operation. There is this radical distinction between them and the Bishop, that his views are mainly æsthetic, whereas with them æsthetics (against the first principles of which we venture to say they are continually offending) is but the handmaid of doctrine. Still it is not difficult to see how opinions such as those just quoted must materially affect his mode of dealing with these disturbers of the peace of the Church and great troublers of modern bishops.

Dr. Harvey Goodwin has, therefore, broken loose from some of the recent traditions of his see, and has taken also a position of antagonism in the Northern Convocation. Indeed, he is a man who must under all circumstances preserve his individuality. He thinks clearly, feels strongly, speaks decidedly, and has now and then shocked con-

ventional feeling almost as much as the Bishop of Manchester. He throws his whole soul into all that he does, and where this quality of character is united with a powerful brain, the man can never sink to the commonplace level. The Bishop of Carlisle has evidently a mind, a will, an energy, and a courage, which give great force to his character. I happened once, by mere accident, to cross his path on a visit of inspection to the Lake district. While resting for an hour or two at a small country inn, a carriage drove up to the church adjoining, containing, as I learned on inquiry, the Bishop and some other official, who had come for the purpose of looking into its condition and that of the parish. It was but a tiny church, and yet as one looked at the thinly-peopled and mountainous region round, it was difficult to see where its congregation was to be gathered. Still the Bishop had thought it right to see it for himself. Whether there was any special business demanding his attention, it was not for a stranger to ask, but I believe there was nothing beyond some contemplated alterations. An observer, however, could not but be impressed with the evident signs of his lordship's conscientiousness in the discharge of a duty which many might have been content to relegate to a subordinate, and of the hearty and intelligent manner in which he appeared to enter into the work. His manner and deportment, so far as they could be judged of from the distance, were in perfect harmony with the ideas given of him by his

public appearances, as one who, while he did his own work thoroughly, was not likely to be tolerant of any indifference or carelessness in others, and perhaps as little likely to be severe upon anything but proved inefficiency, and who, being set to rule, would neither very readily submit to the guidance of others, nor slavishly conform to precedents.

In some respects, indeed, he is one of the ablest men in the Episcopate. There is an amusing sketch of him by an American, who heard him while he was at Cambridge, and was wonderfully impressed not only with his sermon and the attention it commanded from the learned audience to which it was addressed, but with the fact that in speaking of him men dropped the familiar "Reverend," as he says is done in reference to Henry Ward Beecher, and spoke of him only as "Harvey Goodwin." The Americans must be fonder of this disputed little title than any among ourselves, if they use it in common parlance, as is thus suggested. My readers may have heard, indeed, of a great meeting lately, where one of the Church defenders having referred to a Dissenting minister, to whom he was vainly attempting a reply, without the prefix of supposed courtesy, was met by loud cries of "Reverend" from the audience, who, not content with his compliance in the first instance, raised another terrific shout when, having occasion again to speak of the same gentleman, the Church defender very properly thought it unnecessary to repeat the word "Reverend." The effect, of

course, was supremely ludicrous, but not so much so as would be the introduction of this designation in common conversation. But if the dropping of all prefix in the case of a well-known university man was not so remarkable as the American fancied, there is no doubt he was quite right as to the estimation in which Harvey Goodwin was held. He was, in the first place, a great mathematical scholar, and it is in this character that he is still best known to numbers who have profited by some of his very valuable works. The union of mathematical and oratorical powers is not very common, but they are combined in him. It would be exaggeration to speak of him as on a level with the Bishop of Peterborough or even the Bishop of Ely, but with these exceptions he is probably the best preacher among the bishops. It has been said by some that his preaching, in its clearness, directness, and eagerness, reminded them of Newman Hall in his best efforts. The Bishop of Ripon might be compared with him, but it could only be in purely popular audiences that Dr. Bickersteth could enter into the competition. More intelligent and cultivated minds, which would be arrested and impressed by the vigorous thinking and forcible expression of Dr. Harvey Goodwin, would find little to move them in the simple and elegant discourses of the Bishop of Ripon, except the personal earnestness of the preacher, and his faithfulness to his great mission.

With the reputation he had won at Cambridge,

the appointment of Harvey Goodwin to the deanery of Ely was hailed with general approval, and a very happy one it proved. Whatever the duties of a dean may be, it is certain they were performed during his incumbency with a singular fidelity and thoroughness. His estimate of the value of some of them is much higher than ours, but he fully accepted the responsibilities of this exalted conception, and spared no effort to meet them honestly. "There can be no manner of doubt," he says, "that the daily office of the cathedral is the Dean's prime occupation. My own opinion is that, when at home, he should never be absent from a single service unless compelled by infirmity." To carry out this purpose must alone very materially interfere with the common idea of a deanery as a proper retreat for scholars, who may thus be enabled to do some important literary or theological work. The best part of each day must, as he tells us, be so cut up as to be practically lost, but he answers: "There is no pursuit in the world which is not a tie to a man and a restraint upon his liberty, and which is not apt at times to become a snare, just as there is none which has not its own peculiar interest, and does not occasionally offer means of growing wiser and better to those who are engaged in it." That is a very sufficient reason why a clergyman who accepts the office of dean should submit to the necessary restraints and perform the required duties; but it does not touch the question of the wisdom and utility of the system under which the office exists and its duties are defined. On this

point the late Dean leaves us unsatisfied. To superintend the choral boys, to see that the music goes well and express his own judgment in relation to it, and to set an example of the steady performance of duty, may all be important points. But the wisdom of giving such attention to them may be seriously doubted in face of such a statement as this: "Of course it" [the constant attendance at daily service] "is a great snare to those who make no effort to turn it to a moral and spiritual account, as having a tendency to familiarise them with holy things and to lower their standard of reverence, or at least to formalise them." If this be a snare to deans, what must it be to the choral-boys?

This, however, is by the way, but it grows out of the Bishop's recollection of his life as a dean, and his very able and interesting attempt to invest the cathedral work with interest and sanctity. He has succeeded in showing how great the duties were to him, and how anxiously he sought to make them a power for good, but his very honesty baffles his endeavours to represent the system as valuable and praiseworthy. The arrangements about choir boys and lay clerks have evidently perplexed his mind, and the manner in which he writes about them betrays a consciousness that they must ever prove a great difficulty. It is a simple thing to recommend that the lay clerks should be employed as readers, and so spend their time, when not occupied directly or indirectly with their choral work, in such ministrations as could properly be performed by laymen

acting under clerical direction. But this admirable suggestion is at once set aside by the admission that "the necessity of giving prime consideration to musical gifts and musical skill is the first great difficulty in the way." It is good singers who are wanted in cathedral choirs, and, unfortunately, these are not always good Christians. In truth, all the suggestions which Dr. Harvey Goodwin makes on the subject reveal the workings of a mind not at ease in relation to things as they are, but pleasing itself with an ideal which is never likely to be realised, and, in the meantime, trying to take that optimist view which seems so natural in those who have thoroughly imbibed the spirit of the Church Catechism.

Of this spirit there are a great many traces in the Bishop's utterances. He has himself, in the different positions he has occupied, always laboured to turn them to the best account, and to show the possibilities of good in each when its work is conscientiously performed. But while recognising this personal excellence, it is almost amusing to see how invariably he arrives at the conclusion that, both as regards doctrines and arrangements, the Church of England has found that happy mean in which is perfect wisdom.

> "Despite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
> One thing is clear, whatever is is right,"

is the comfortable feeling which he cherishes, and endeavours to inspire in others. Practical evils, of course, there may be in the working out of the

system, but the system itself is little short of perfection. Thus, in his lectures on the Church Catechism, he deals with some points which it is evident he feels may be open to doubt, but after setting forth what to the majority of minds would certainly seem to be the rational view, he immediately proceeds to urge some plausible plea in support of the course which has actually been adopted. A remarkable instance of this appears in his comments on the second part of the Catechism, which, as it was only an afterthought, added as sacerdotal views were developing themselves strongly in the reign of James I., may fairly be regarded as not absolutely essential in a manual for children. We feel we might almost say that, at the time when he gave the lectures, Dr. Harvey Goodwin, as yet only the minister of St. Edward's, Cambridge, had his own misgivings as to the wisdom of the addition. At all events, he admits that it goes beyond the line marked out by the original compilers of the Catechism, and beyond what was essential to their proposed design, and with great truth says: "It might be argued that it was undesirable to bring such difficult questions before the minds of young persons, that it would be much better to confine their attention to plain matters of faith and duty, to bring all the force possible to bear upon the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and to leave questions concerning what constitutes a sacrament, the propriety of infant baptism, and the benefits of the Lord's Supper, for further and more deliberate consideration." He

himself recognises the force of this view, which will undoubtedly approve itself to nine-tenths of all intelligent men who are not biassed by their connection with a particular system.

But the revisers of the Catechism judged otherwise, and they have put into it those questions and answers, which are puzzling enough for older brains, and open up an almost boundless field of controversy, to be learned by children and young people, whose ideas of them must necessarily be of the most hazy and indefinite kind. Therefore to all good Churchmen it is clearly best that the addition should have been made, and the conclusion having been once accepted, it is not difficult to find reasons by which to sustain it. "I am glad that the addition to the Catechism was made." We wish that, in reading this, we could avoid feeling that, had the fact been otherwise, Dr. Goodwin would have been equally glad, and equally prepared with a rational explanation of the pleasure which he felt in the fact that the Church had shown such consummate wisdom in studying the capacities and needs of the babes, and in making suitable provision for them. There is no insincerity in this. It is simply the spell of the system which is upon his mind, and the way in which it thus acts is, in reality, one of the strongest objections to it. It sets up the Church as an idol, to which the absolute homage both of intellect and head must be given, and though it does not forbid all free inquiry, it so cramps the mind with gyves and fetters as to render liberty

impossible. A teacher is conscious of the peril of allowing his hearers to entertain doubts as to the infallibility of Creed or Catechism, and if any doubts suggest themselves to his own mind, does his best to refute them. The impossibility of making any change, and the danger even of proposing it, unconsciously affect his mind, and dispose him to become a defender of that which is established and apparently immovable. How much the Church herself suffers in consequence of the impossibility of reform —for such in truth it practically is—it is not easy to conjecture; but the injury done to individuals placed in this false position is not less serious, and it is all the worse because they themselves are, for the most part, insensible of the evil influences to which they succumb.

The Bishop of Carlisle is, undoubtedly, in every sense, a loyal son of the Church, and if at times one may be surprised at the reasoning by which he has persuaded himself, but by which he is not likely to persuade any unprejudiced minds, into an approval of her teaching and discipline, it is beyond question that it has satisfied his own mind. He would probably himself disclaim a connection with any of the parties into which the Church is divided, and, in fact, has certain affinities which unite him more or less with all of them. Evangelical doctrine is no longer as it once was, the property of any one school, and if, in some of their principles, he agrees with the Evangelicals, there are others of their distinctive tenets with which he can have but little sympathy.

His æsthetic tastes, as has been seen, must to some extent incline him towards the Ritualists, whose views of the authority of the Church he also holds, though probably in a modified form. On the other hand, he has an intellectual freedom and liberality which might almost justify us in classing him among the Broad Church. But he is before everything else a Churchman, and it is to his credit that he has always sought to increase the usefulness, as well as strengthen the power, of the institution to which he is conscientiously attached.

It was not to be expected that his rule at Carlisle would, in all points, be satisfactory to the party which had so long been predominant there. He could not carry out, in its integrity, the policy of a Waldegrave; but he has certainly sought not to make the change more violent than was requisite if he was to act on his own convictions at all. Shortly after his promotion to the see, he was invited to become President of the local Bible Society, of which his predecessors had been such decided supporters. As he had never identified himself with the Society, the reason for the invitation is not exactly apparent. Considering that the British and Foreign Bible Society is neutral in its principles and constitution, it is somewhat strange that its offices should be so frequently offered to the representatives of a particular Church, simply because of their official position. But so it continually is. There may sometimes be seen a young rector, who had succeeded to a family living, promoted at once to the presidency of a local

auxiliary, as though the one office were an appendage of the other, and then, as was not very wonderful, taking the cue and proceeding to act as though the Society were one of his own parochial institutions, over which he ruled as of indisputable right. If this be done in the case of parish clergymen, much more is it likely to be done when a Bishop can be induced to give his name and sanction to the work. Perhaps it is thought that Nonconformists are sure, under all circumstances, to promote to their utmost the interests of a Society with which they have always been so closely identified, and there are not a few who would fancy it very presumptuous in them to press any claim for equality, even in a catholic and neutral institution. The Carlisle auxiliary, in fact, was only following a common precedent in asking the new Bishop to become its President, and he showed his readiness to conciliate as far as possible by accepting the office, although he confessed he had had some difficulties as to its principles and constitution. It was a sign, at all events, of moderation, that he was unwilling to break entirely with the traditions of the diocese, and ready, as far as practicable, to enter into fellowship even with Nonconformists.

In his place in the Northern Convocation, however, he has taken a very decided position in opposition to the views of the Evangelical party. In the great debate of last year relative to the Eastward position, he not only argued in favour of liberty and in support of the hollow and unreal

compromise which is content to sacrifice truth and peace by pronouncing this and other disputed points of ritual devoid of doctrinal significance, but announced his own intention to pursue a course of action which is not only opposed to the wishes of strong Protestants, but which it would be very difficult to reconcile with obedience to the law. The provision of the Act which gives the bishop of a diocese a discretion in relation to prosecutions which he may be asked to sanction was unfortunate, but it was certainly never intended to enable him to assert a supremacy to the law. But this was practically what the Bishop of Carlisle declared his intention of doing under certain circumstances. He supposed the case of a clergyman, active, useful, and honoured in his parish, who nevertheless persisted in adopting the Eastward position in opposition to the wishes of a small but earnest section of his congregation, and he declared that he would rather sacrifice his see than allow this aggrieved party to take action against its pastor. On no sound principles can such a determination be justified. The Bishop is not the law, nor has he a right to assume the liberty of setting aside a law by which he and the clergyman, on whose behalf he thus proposed to interfere, are equally bound. If the Courts pronounce that either position is legal, or if (supposing them to declare in favour either of one or the other) the Legislature should still resolve to grant a liberty which is not at present allowable, the Bishop would

be within his province in seeking to repress any eager partisans who sought to coerce the clergy into the adoption of their views. But just as in such case he would only be making a proper use of his power in resisting any attempts to set up a lay tyranny, so are the laity warranted now in protesting against his efforts to set himself above that law which, as we are so often told, is their chief safeguard. It is too much the habit of the bishops to regard themselves as absolute rulers, and to grasp at prerogatives which certainly do not belong to them. In relation to the suits under the Public Worship Act, they have to discharge the functions of an executive, exercising such discretion only as is necessary to guard against any display of personal malignity, or against vexatious prosecutions merely intended to harass. To forbid a suit because the clergyman against whom it is directed is a pious and devoted man, or because his alleged breaches of the law are approved by a majority of his parishioners, is to usurp a power to which they have no title. Of course this supposes a curtailment of personal liberty, and the one point which numbers both of the clergy and the laity seem unable to understand is, that this is what they must submit to if they would have the prestige and glory of the Establishment.

The Bishop himself is so zealous a defender of that Establishment to whose law he is so indisposed to yield absolute obedience, that he undertook a reply to Mr. Bright's great speech at Birmingham.

It was not very original, or profound, or successful; but there was a heartiness about it which was to be admired. He was anxious, first, to clear the clergy from the imputation of having claimed to be gentlemen; but the labour might have been spared, for the question is not what the clergy themselves say, but what many of their advocates say for them. The Bishop does not need to be told that one of the favourite pleas for the Establishment is, that it places an educated Christian gentleman in every parish; and if Mr. Bright, placing the argument in a rhetorical form, had represented it as coming from the clergy themselves, it was hardly worth while for so eminent a champion of the Church to spend his strength upon an error of this kind, if, indeed, error it be. But, in fact, Mr. Bright's language did not justify the Bishop's criticism, which was more creditable to his ingenuity than to his fairness. "Who," says Mr. Bright, "are those thousands of clergymen of the Church of England? Men who know very little of Dissenting ministers say that, in comparison with Dissenting ministers, they are gentlemen." "I should like," says the Bishop, "to see any clergyman who ever made such an ungentlemanly statement." "They say," again says Mr. Bright, "they are the sons of gentlemen." "I should like," replies the Bishop, "to know the clergyman who ever made this boast." It is clear, on the most cursory glance, that here the Bishop has wasted his righteous indignation, inasmuch as he is combating an assertion which

is not found in the passage he quotes from Mr. Bright's speech. What he says is, "that there are men who know very little of Dissenting ministers" who talk in this fashion; and the Bishop must be strangely ignorant of a style of argument which is very extensively employed if he can contradict the statement.

The assurance which the Bishop proceeded to give, that he did not inquire whether the candidates who sought ordination at his hands were gentlemen or graduates of the universities, was really quite superfluous. No one has ever gone so far as to suggest that all the clergy were gentlemen or scholars, though there is a quiet assumption on the part of not a few that their office is a guarantee that they are both. The spirit of the system, however, reveals itself in his suggestion—that it is very desirable that clergymen should be the sons of gentlemen, and gentlemen themselves. That every Christian minister should be a gentleman, in the true sense of the term, is, of course, greatly to be wished; whether it is equally expedient that they should be of gentle birth, is, at least, open to question. Many hold, on the contrary, that a Church should seek her ministers in all classes, and that, if she would have a hold on the masses, it is essential she should have men whose personal experience enables them to understand the feelings and adapt themselves to the wants of the people. But it is satisfactory to find that, at all events, the Bishop considers that it would be very ungentlemanly

in aristocratic clergymen to boast either of their birth or breeding, and it is to be wished his words had made their due impression on those to whom they were specially suited. We might then have been spared some of the protests against the indignity which would be put upon the clergy if Dissenting ministers be allowed to officiate in their churchyards, and so have escaped the needless bitterness which has been infused into that as well as all our ecclesiastical controversies. We wonder whether the Bishop would think it quite gentlemanly for a clergyman to talk about coming down to the level of Nonconformist ministers. The man who speaks thus does not say that he is more of a gentleman than his Dissenting neighbour, but there is a tone of lofty assumption in the language which is equally offensive. His claim to superiority, it may be said, rests on his priesthood, and, if that be all, Nonconformists may well be content to bear any affront which it implies, for they must at once confess that whatever distinction attaches to priests, they neither have, nor desire to have, a share in it. All that, however, would pass for as little in the case of the Anglican, as it does in that of the Romish priests, but for the position which the State gives and the assumed social precedence it is supposed to confer. The "gentlemen" and "sons of gentlemen" who are found among the clergy would be among the last to presume on this; and the Bishop does but express the feeling which prevails among this class, except where party

antagonism may have produced another sentiment. It is in the class where there is less of culture and refinement—the *literates*, the perverts from Dissent, who fancy that their change of Church means a graduation in gentlemanliness—the alumni of St. Bees and similar institutions—that this clerical hauteur chiefly prevails. It is unfortunate that such elements should ever have been introduced into the discussion, and the Bishop, at least, did good service by indicating his own disapproval of such a plea. If it be "ungentlemanly" for clergymen to use it themselves, it is hardly less so for others to use it for them. It is an insult, not an argument; and, while it must irritate, will do nothing to convince. It is true it tells with those who desire that their religion, like everything else belonging to them, should be in the highest style of fashion; but those who are thus gained count for nothing, while the unworthy means by which such an advantage is secured must react against those who resort to them. If bishops generally would treat this kind of language, and a bearing and deportment in harmony with it, as "ungentlemanly," they would do much towards softening the asperities of controversy.

Though the Bishop of Carlisle has set so good an example in this respect, there is no reason to suppose that it arises out of any favourable disposition to Nonconformists, but rather from the fact that he is something more than a mere ecclesiastic. He expressed his dissent from the

action of his brother of Lincoln and the Vicar of Owston Ferry long before the decision of the Privy Council was given, and he placed it on much the same ground as the Lord Chancellor afterwards took. "I always, in communication with Dissenting ministers, give them the title of 'Reverend.' I do this on a very simple principle—that in every society every man ought to have given to him by his fellows that title which he holds to belong to him, unless there is anything wrong or offensive in the title." There is in that a common sense which, if it were more frequent among the clergy, and even on the Episcopal Bench, would save their order and Church from a great deal of needless odium. But there is in it also that absence of imagination and the kind of sympathy it creates, even with those to whose views a man may be most opposed, which is a conspicuous defect in the Bishop. He is an eminently practical man, a hard worker, and an energetic administrator. His anxious desire to make his influence felt for good throughout a diocese which, from the character developed among the thinly-scattered population of a wild and mountainous district, has special difficulties of its own, and the thoroughly unconventional and unecclesiastical manner in which he deals with the practical questions which arise out of the work, deserves all praise. But this matter-of-fact spirit, which leads him to attach more importance to the way in which his clergy are to get from one point of their large parishes to another than to the determination of the position

they ought to take and the vestments they should wear at the altar, really incapacitates him for grappling with the serious difficulties of his position. Thus, when speaking of the disputes about the Rubrics, and the divisions to which they have given rise, he says: "I know, of course, the argument that little things may not really be trifles, and that the fate of a nation may depend upon the colour of a flag; but this is quite certain, that it is an indication of ill-health and disease in the body politic when it is so." It is not necessary here to discuss the truth of the proposition said to be "quite certain," but which a large class of people will hold to be a complete fallacy, the belief in which is a sign of imperfection in the Bishop. What it proves to us is, that Dr. Harvey Goodwin, with all his great spiritual and intellectual qualities, is unable to render his Church that guidance which she so sorely needs in this crisis, from incapacity to appreciate fully the causes which are working to produce it. The flag has its power, and will continue to have it, even though practical men should persist in saying that it is a sign of ill-health to attach importance to such trifles.

CANON LIDDON.

HOW significant of the great change which has passed over the Anglican Church since the commencement of the Tractarian movement, is the contrast between *the* Canon of St. Paul's forty years ago, and *the* Canon of to-day. The former, the dignitary who towered above his fellows and enjoyed an unrivalled reputation throughout the country, was Sydney Smith, who is continually spoken of as the "witty Canon:" the keen critic; the shrewd and active politician, who was zealous for reform everywhere except in the Establishment; the sparkling humorist, who, unfortunately for himself, and even more so for his Church, had been trained for a profession with whose highest aims and duties he had little sympathy, and in which his brilliant gifts were, to a large extent, wasted. The man, however, strange as he would appear in the cathedral amid the surroundings of to-day, was not such an anomaly in his own time as we, judging him from the standpoint of the present, might

suppose. His Whig politics were, of course, extremely offensive, and they were more so then than they would be now. Many of his sallies were felt to be unbecoming the sanctity and dignity (the dignity being thought quite as much of as the sanctity) of his profession; and the distinction which he enjoyed belonged to him rather in his literary than in his clerical character. But if there was felt to be any incongruity between his spirit and some of his sayings and doings and his position, it was rather because his talents attracted more attention to him than to others who belonged to the same school of thought. The cathedral and the Canon, indeed, were so far in keeping, that both were eminently unecclesiastical, and even a dignitary who could pour ridicule and contempt upon the work of Christian missionaries, in a style which would have been more appropriate to a Rationalist critic, to whom Christianity itself was an object of scorn, was hardly out of place in an age and a community so lacking in spiritual fervour and in Evangelical faith. He was, no doubt, regarded by a large body of the clergy as a discredit to their order, but with the majority of them that was not because of the faults for which he deserved most censure, but rather for those broader views which would have deserved commendation had they been associated with sincere devotion to the great work he had to do.

There may be some (though we, certainly, are not of the number) who will doubt whether

English religion will really be much the gainer by the substitution of the able, devout, and eloquent, but eminently sacerdotal Canon who now occupies the prominent place in the Chapter of St. Paul's; but none will question that he is pre-eminently the Canon of his day. He has, indeed, one colleague who is a fiercer partisan, and is more frequently found in the front when the battle of the Establishment is to be fought against Nonconformists and Liberals—the ardent and not very scrupulous champion of Denominational education, whom friends and foes can always admire for his pluck, even if they cannot applaud his prudence; and there is another, who may possibly be more learned, and to whom, certainly, all Churches owe a debt of gratitude for the work he is doing in opposing the scepticism of the day. But Canon Liddon exerts so much more extensive an influence, holds so much more prominent a place in the public eye, and enjoys a popularity so much wider than either of them, that it is not invidious to call him *the* Canon of St. Paul's. And what a marvellous change, from his predecessor of ante-Tractarian times to him! The interval was, in some sense, bridged over by Henry Melville, who had as little sympathy with the advanced sacerdotalism of the one as with the Latitudinarian tendencies of the other, whose High Church proclivities were held in check by his decidedly Evangelical opinions, and whose power was sought in the pulpit rather than in the altar. But for the interpolation of the great

preacher, the contrast between Sydney Smith and Canon Liddon would have been still more complete and striking; but the tone of Church feeling has gradually risen, and it is only as we place the two extremes in juxtaposition that we become conscious of the revolution that has been wrought and which is still in progress. Forty, or even thirty years ago, no Minister would have dared to promote a divine of Dr. Liddon's strong views to the position he at present fills, and in many respects adorns, and certainly he would be a very daring man indeed who should now confer such an honour on Sydney Smith.

The fact has a significance which but few of the friends of the Establishment seem able to appreciate. It should teach them if they were willing to learn, that their Church has entered on a new era, and with it, in all probability, on a new chapter in its destinies. For forty years the seeds of Sacramental doctrine have been scattered broadcast among them, each year adding to the number of those whose glory it is to take part in the sowing, and now the seeds are, in the natural course of events, beginning to bear fruit after their kind. The generation which had grown up under the influences of the Evangelical movement is rapidly passing away, and of those who rise to fill the places of its promoters, a large proportion, and a proportion which is continually increasing, have been trained in principles more or less Ritualistic. The evil grows—for the present seems likely to

grow—because there has been a steady development of this sacerdotal movement, and each decade, almost each year, has added to the number of its clerical promoters, and consequently to the numbers affected by their teaching.

Protestantism exercises a very different influence in certain strata of society to-day from what it did thirty years ago. There is no longer in them the old instinctive shrinking from Romish ideas and practices, and the unintelligent prejudice which was once too readily accepted as an evidence of Protestant feeling, has been exchanged by a national reaction for a disposition to accept novelties which the clergy commend as Catholic. The tendency is materially helped by the weakness with which certain Evangelicals have sought to accommodate themselves to the spirit of the times, and to harmonise, as far as practicable, their doctrines as well as their practices with those of the Anglican schools. One of the latest and most remarkable illustrations of this was seen in the attempt of Mr. Titcomb, immediately after he had been made a Canon, to reconcile—what of all things would seem most incapable of reconciliation—the theories of the two schools on the subject of the priesthood, by suggesting that while all Christians are priests, the clergy are an order by whom the priestly functions are discharged as representatives of the whole body. Such a display of weakness needs no comment, but it indicates the strength of the current which is at present sweeping over the Church.

If it affects even Evangelical clergymen, it is not surprising that there are numbers among the laity who are carried away by it. It would be untrue, and impolitic as well, to talk of Ritualism, even in its more extreme forms, as peculiar to the clergy. There are intelligent, independent, devout laymen who have overcome even the old English feeling against the confessional, and seem to find pleasure in proclaiming that they have recourse to it themselves, and are pleased to know that their wives and daughters do the same. It is a singular hallucination, and possibly may not last; but in the meantime the party is not inconsiderable, and Canon Liddon is regarded by them with an affectionate loyalty as their most able and honoured leader. I happened on one occasion to attend a meeting at which a number of the party were present, and the mere mention of his name called forth strong expressions of feeling, which testified to the enthusiastic devotion which is cherished towards him. The adherents of the party, indeed, have all the passionate fervour of neophytes, and of neophytes who have the idea that they are persecuted. They are always ready, therefore, for strong demonstration, either of fervid loyalty or bitter antagonism. It must be said they are, if possible, more hearty in their abuse of opponents than even in their applause of friends. They follow the lead of their journals, and those who deal with their principles publicly must not expect mercy at their hands. Not content with

public criticism, they will often pelt offenders with anonymous letters, which show more of the spite of the partisan than the temper of the Christian. Thus a speaker, and one who has the highest possible respect for Canon Liddon, ventured to comment on his discussion with Monsignor Capel, and though his observations were innocent enough, they very speedily drew down a tirade of abuse and insolence from some hot-headed youth, who seemed quite unable to perceive that a criticism of the Canon's arguments, or a dissent from his conclusions, was perfectly consistent with the highest esteem alike for his piety and his abilities. It is a small matter, but it is just such incidents which indicate the spirit of the party, and especially the feeling with which they regard their leader.

Dr. Pusey, indeed, the patriarch of the school, at times shows a remarkable vigour in the advocacy of its principles, and no doubt exercises more influence in the shaping of its policy than is apparent to the outside world. But Canon Liddon, as a much younger man, in the very prime of his life and power, at the very centre of thought and activity, with a greater capacity for reaching and moving the popular mind, is the true chief. An Oxford Professor, of more than seventy years of age, and whose gifts, distinguished as they are, are not those by which great assemblies are moved, or the minds of more than a select circle of disciples greatly stirred, can be only a nominal leader. It is on one who can bring more of per-

sonal labour and influence to the work that the chief responsibility must rest; and the Canon of St. Paul's is in every way marked out for the distinction. Between the two men there can be no rivalry, and the younger, in fact, seems to look up to the other with a reverence as much in accord with his own character as it is merited by the long experience and valued services of him to whom it is rendered; while Dr. Pusey, in his turn, must be rejoiced to feel that the work in which he has taken a paternal interest is not at all likely to suffer in the hands of his successor.

Canon Liddon is a representative of whom any Church might be proud, and it is not the least misfortune which the Evangelicals have to-day that the chief of their opponents is a man in every way so competent to deal with the questions at issue, so resolute in the maintenance of what he believes to be truth, and so universally respected by all who can appreciate great intellectual and spiritual worth. They, perhaps, have felt less of the broadening influences of the day than any other school, and are still too prone to judge men by their doctrinal or ecclesiastical position, and for that reason are hardly able to appreciate the great accession of force which the name and character of a man like Dr. Liddon brings to his party. In their view he is one of those who are corrupting the faith of the nation and betraying the trust of the Church, and they do not see that to impartial men outside, even to those who do not see how it is possible for him

to reconcile his teachings with the formularies he has accepted, he is an earnest, religious man, living up to his light, and serving God according to the dictates of his own conscience, a bright example of great talent, sanctified by a piety which is genuine and ardent, even if in the judgment of some it be narrow and mistaken.

Such a man must be a strength to any association with which he is identified, and he is undoubtedly the *decus et tutamen* of Ritualism to-day, not the less so because he does not sanction all the extravagances of the more unwise members of the party. It is instructive to mark the mode in which he speaks of them, and to compare it with the bearing of some others towards the advanced wing of their party. There are even among Nonconformists some who seem to be pillars, whose one great desire is to purge themselves from all suspicion of complicity with extreme men. They admit that they hold the same principles, but they are careful to let it be known that they hold them in a different sense, and altogether disapprove of the strong measures used for their promotion. They are much more anxious to conciliate the more moderate of their opponents than to maintain their loyalty to the more extreme of their friends. Canon Liddon might well have been excused if he had adopted such a policy when confronted with some of the foolish language used by indiscreet allies, and had at once broken the force of

Monsignor Capel's reasonings, by disavowing those who had exposed themselves to such an attack. But he was too loyal, too noble, and too wise also, to have recourse to such an expedient, and so, while expressing regret for their errors, he did his best to excuse the men. It is one of the signs of a true leader that he should be ready thus in some degree to compromise himself rather than allow reproach to rest on those with whom, though they may in his judgment have transgressed the bounds of prudence, he is still in sympathy, on whose hearty loyalty he can always count, and whose support he knows he will one day need.

The process of manufacturing a leader is, as was seen when the Liberal party had to undertake the task, encompassed with so much difficulty, and the result, though obtained at considerable cost, is often so unsatisfactory, that when men find one prepared for the position, it is not wonderful that they are ready to repose in him strong confidence, especially if, instead of assuming a tone of command, he quietly does the work which he finds marked out for him with decision and strength, and so draws others towards him. This has been pre-eminently the case with Dr. Liddon. Obtrusive, forward, ambitious of influence he has never been; but influence and leadership have come to him naturally in the course of events, and by the force of his own character. He has some of the highest qualifications for the position—enthusiastic devotion to a faith, combined with judgment and moderation

in his policy; a courage which is ever ready for determined action, and a loyalty to principle which, if circumstances demanded, would make him a confessor; a devout temper, and a generous sympathy, which, however, does not restrain that burning zeal against error and wrong which makes him so eager and determined a combatant. Moral courage, and that developed in a high degree, is one of his most marked characteristics. He never hesitates to take the ground which he believes to be right, and to hold it against all comers, and instead of weakly shrinking from conflict, seems to find a pleasure in rushing into the thick of the fray, and doing good yeoman's service for the cause he loves.

In many questions which interest clergymen generally, he takes no part. He is able, as a brief but remarkable letter which he addressed to the *Times* after the passing of the Public Worship Act showed, to discriminate between what he called the "material and spiritual ingredients" of which the Church is composed, and, holding the former of small account as compared with the latter, he is ever ready to come to the front when the interests of Catholic "truth" or practice are concerned, but about the former he has not shown much interest. He has never been prominent in the defence of the Establishment, and would, we have no doubt, sacrifice all its supposed advantages rather than compromise a single iota of principle. In the struggle against any tampering with the Athanasian Creed, in the resistance to the decision of the

Judicial Committee relative to the eastward position, in the criticism of the Public Worship Regulation Act, in the endeavour generally to uphold the rights of the High Church party, whether in opposition to Romish assailants on the one hand or Evangelical critics on the other, he has been foremost; but the defenders of the Establishment may well regard him with anxiety, for there are few men who, under certain possible and indeed probable contingencies, would be more likely to take a step which would involve its destruction. He is the very man, if he is read aright, to be the leader in a great secession, if his continuance in the Establishment ever became inconsistent with his loyalty to Christ and the Church. Where others may indulge in strong words, in which the vehement feeling of the hour might find an easy and safe mode of escape, he would *act*, for his soul is possessed with the principles for which he contends, and, undisturbed by the coward fears of men with less faith, he is prepared to assert them whatever be the result to any human institution.

In the present state of the Anglican Church such a man is a grave peril. How far he is prepared to go he has already shown by his announcement to his Bishop that he would disobey the law as laid down by the highest court in the land, and was prepared to abide the results of any proceedings against him. It may be said that the defiance was safe enough, for good Dr. Jackson, who is so ready to come down upon an unpopular prelate like Dr.

Colenso, or to restrain a few over-liberal Evangelicals in proceedings like those of Mr. Fremantle, which the great majority of the clergy are certain to disapprove, is sure to think once, twice, and even three times, before he provokes a contest with the main body of the High Church party, so powerful in its numbers, and even more so in its social and ecclesiastical influence. But it was not the weak Bishop only whom Canon Liddon defied; it was the whole force of law which the Establishment can command. The letter in which he and Canon Gregory united was really a challenge to the law to do its worst—an implied intimation that if it would not allow them to exercise their liberty on the point in question, they would wipe the dust of the Establishment off the soles of their feet.

The practice on which they took their stand is, indeed, the crucial point in the struggle on which the Establishment is entering, and to whose gravity so many of its champions seem strangely insensible. Is the eastward position to be tolerated or not? If it is, there must be an end of the talk about stamping out Ritualism; if it is not, then it is clear that some decisive action will be taken by Canon Liddon; and if he and others like him lead, they will not be without a following. Foreseeing this contingency, there are some who would fain represent the whole question as one of small importance; but it is too late to take such ground, even if High Churchmen would accept the view. The difficulty, however, does not end here. There

are some who might be willing to sacrifice the extreme men of the party if they could make their own position good. But Dr. Liddon would be the very last to adopt so selfish a policy. Men of his calibre, who have no disposition for compromise, and no genius for it; who take counsel with their consciences and hearts, not with flesh and blood; who listen to the inspirations of holy purpose where others are guided by expediency, and who will do what they hold right without care for consequences, are the glory and strength of a Church. But they are a peril to an Establishment, and especially to one built on such a sandy foundation as that on which the Anglican Church rests.

Dr. Liddon is not one with whom it would be wise or safe to trifle, treating his words as mere vapourings, and supposing that if a crisis should come he would be anxious to avoid extremes, and in his desire to preserve the Establishment sacrifice his own consistency. Like every true man, he has no doubt of the vitality of the Church, whatever comes of the "material ingredients" which belong to it as an Establishment; but he would feel that her character would be fatally compromised and her power impaired by the surrender of any point of her "Catholic" inheritance. No desire to keep the peace would induce him to make any concession which might even seem to indicate a doubt as to the reality of his priestly character. If the anti-sacerdotalism of the Evangelicals or of the Erastians is equally firm and decided, it is difficult

to see how a collision, entailing the most serious consequences, is to be avoided. To sum up, the eastward position, which of course is valued and maintained only as a symbol of the nature of the service and the character of the officiating minister, must be conceded, or Canon Liddon and those of like faith and spirit will certainly secede; but if this be granted, it is hard to see what the Public Worship Act will have done, except to give new strength and security to the very element it was intended to suppress. A very interesting paper was recently published by an Evangelical Churchman, who does not like the idea of Disestablishment, proposing certain reforms in the Prayer-Book, such as the substitution of the word "minister" for "priest," with other changes in harmony with it, by which Ritualism would be made impossible. The innocent simplicity of such suggestions is extraordinary. They have not even a chance of being seriously entertained, much less adopted; and it is amusing to find them thus gravely proposed at a time when the great difficulty is to retain that amount of Protestantism which the Church possesses. When dreamers of this type have shown how it is possible to escape a surrender to the Ritualists on what is really the turning-point of the controversy, it will be time enough to consider what steps may be taken to attempt what would be nothing less than a revolution, and a revolution which is sure to be disintegrating in its results.

The controversy between Monsignor Capel and Canon Liddon — which attracted an amount of public attention, and filled a space in our daily papers seldom given to theological discussions— while it is a sign of the times, was very instructive as a revelation of the Canon's character and views. Whatever may be thought of the tenableness of his position or of the conclusiveness of his reasoning, there can hardly be a second opinion among impartial men as to the earnestness of his spirit, the sincerity of his convictions, and, what is unfortunately more rare in such struggles, the chivalry of his temper. The Romish divine is, perhaps, the more able controversialist, although his superiority even in this respect may probably be due chiefly to the strength of a case against which his Anglican opponent contended in vain; but there was something in the tone of the latter which won sympathy, even from those who remained unconvinced by his skilful dialectics. The weakness of Anglican Catholicism is never more apparent than when a man of great power and logical acumen shows himself so helpless in the hands of a practised Romish disputant.

Canon Liddon no doubt believes that there is a substantial difference between the theory of the most advanced Ritualist and the doctrine of the Romish Church, and that it is possible to set up some standard of "Catholic" tradition and authority by which the former may be justified, while the latter is rejected. But on this the

judgment of the majority of men will be against him. There may be differences perceptible enough to trained theologians between Ritualist and Romish teaching, but to plain men and for all practical purposes, they are substantially the same, and a long experience proves that the former must lead on to the latter. What disturbed many people, too, was that Dr. Liddon was much more anxious to find excuses for those whose very strong sacramental expressions he was compelled to disavow, than to censure, in the language they deserve, any approaches to a system which he himself condemns. When a Canon of St. Paul's, one of the most eloquent preachers the Church can boast, and one wielding a power of personal influence which few can rival, thus refuses to sever himself from those whose extravagance he is forced to acknowledge, it is worse than folly to talk as though it was a very small section of the clergy who are involved in the lawlessness of Ritualism.

As a preacher Dr. Liddon has few equals. His extreme popularity, however, is a puzzle to numbers. It must be especially so to those who, being failures themselves, complacently fancy that successful preachers must necessarily be superficial, showy, sensational, and that, in their own case, it is their unwillingness to stoop to this low level of thought and feeling which has prevented their achieving greater results. The theory is a pleasant one for themselves, and at first

seems to have a certain amount of truth in it. At all events, it may be assumed that the man who disdains all popular arts, eschews rhetoric, refuses to shape his thought and style so as to suit the fashion of the hour and catch the ear of the multitude, and addresses himself to the thoughtful few, must be content with a more limited audience and a less pronounced and striking success. He ought, however, to be the very last man to complain of such consequences, or to grudge others the power which he does not care to cultivate. The world has room enough for all classes of preachers who love the Gospel and speak it earnestly and faithfully, and the man who has learned to do his own work and fill his own place need not be disquieted, still less envious, because others, of a type altogether different from himself, enjoy a popularity to which he cannot pretend.

But the Canon is a living contradiction to this very common view. His success is an evidence that the highest kind of excellence is compatible with the exercise of that power over large promiscuous gatherings which is assumed to be attainable only by men of a very different order. His sermons are not what would be regarded as popular. In the first place, they have not the recommendation, which to many hearers is greater than any other, of brevity. Then they are chaste, finished, somewhat elaborate compositions, with great logical strength as well as rhetorical beauty. A critic might pronounce them too intellectual, too strong,

involving too severe a tax upon the attention of the majority, to be generally acceptable. It must be added that if they are heard in St. Paul's their effect is not improved, except for the comparatively small number who can get within easy distance of the pulpit, and can see and hear without an unpleasant effort. It is very common to hear expressions of disappointment from those who have mingled in the congregations which throng the Cathedral when he preaches. They have either not heard at all, or heard with such difficulty as to lose all enjoyment. The fault is not in the man, but in the church, which was not intended for preaching. It is necessary to hear him in a smaller place to come under the spell of that intense earnestness of soul which expresses itself in his style of delivery, and which lends so much additional power to the forcible reasonings and thrilling appeals of his discourses. The student, in his private reading, is alive to their high intellectual and moral qualities, their clearness of conception, their logical vigour, their style so rich and varied in its beauty, their strong faith, their lofty courage; but only the hearer who is so situated that he can feel the power of the man, can have an adequate conception of their real character. The preacher seems to be consumed by his theme, and the glow of his holy passion necessarily communicates itself in some measure to his audience. His is the strength not only of a vigorous intellect or an eloquent tongue, but of a soul full of the fire of faith and love. It is to us a sad thought

that such a force should be enlisted on behalf of theories which rob the Gospel, which he sets forth with a beauty and an eloquence seldom equalled, of its simplicity and its true glory. He must be a puzzle to the simple-minded people who assert that the only thing necessary for meeting Ritualism is the re-assertion of the fundamental principles of the Gospel. Dr. Liddon preaches these as clearly and much more ably than themselves, but he preaches at the same time doctrines which must be met and confuted, if the Protestant faith is not to be overthrown.

To hear him preach when he is at his best is not only a high intellectual pleasure, but a healthful stimulus to brain and heart. There may be much in the teaching from which to dissent, but there is a spiritual power which asserts itself even over minds most strongly opposed to certain points in the doctrine. But it is when he is dealing with some of the cardinal points of the Christian faith, bringing all the force both of his reasoning and his eloquence to bear upon it, that the full beauty and force of his preaching is realised. I had the pleasure to listen to a remarkable discourse of this character which he delivered on Easter Sunday. It was a very masterly demonstration of the impossibility that Christ should be holden of death, and as there were but few of those Church references which jar upon Dissenting, or rather Protestant, susceptibilities, the enjoyment was unalloyed. The argument was clear and forcible, and it was pre-

sented in exquisite form, and enforced with all the earnestness which is characteristic of the preacher. If there was anything that detracted from the refreshing spiritual influence of the service, it was the view of the altar and its surroundings, indicating only too clearly the spirit which at present rules in the Cathedral.

There are those who fancy that the admiration and respect which Dissenters sometimes express for men of Dr. Liddon's type, indicate an insensibility to the perils of that sacerdotalism of which they are the representatives. There could be no greater mistake. In Church principles we are wide as the poles asunder, but we can still admire the great intellectual power, and sympathise with the deep spiritual fervour, even of strongest ecclesiastical antagonists.

THE LATE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

IT is not difficult to picture the kind of bishop who would satisfy that strong party in the Establishment whose views find an exponent in the *Times*. He should be a man of great intellectual force, to maintain the dignity of his office and the prestige of the Church itself, but his power should be kept under proper restraint, lest it should tempt him into dangerous speculation, or, what would be worse still, into an undue exaltation of his own prerogatives. He must be a man of high repute in personal character, and, if possible, also in diocesan work, but should beware of manifesting too much zeal, or forgetting that if it be at all his duty to promote the interests of Christ's truth and kingdom, it must be done in such a way as not to endanger the security of the Establishment. Of course, it is not only right but necessary that he be esteemed a religious man, but even his piety ought to be tempered by something of a mundane spirit, so that he may deport himself becomingly

in society, be able to meet men of the world on their own ground, understand what is due to the necessities of social and political life, and, in general, be qualified to maintain the dignity of the peer as well as the sanctity of the prelate. A slight excess of pliability, a little suppleness, even an occasional display of inconsistency, could be more readily pardoned than an earnestness which in the eyes of Erastian champions of the Establishment is nothing less than fanaticism. In their view, it is infinitely better that a bishop should err on the side of leniency than of severity; that he should be open to the suspicion of Latitudinarianism than have a taint of bigotry, or of that fixedness of conviction and loyalty to principle which are confounded with it; that he should be unduly pliable than severely rigid. If Paul, or a man of his spirit, were by some strange chance to find his way on to the Bench, and to obey the divine necessity which compelled him to rebuke popular vices and preach unpopular truths, above all things to preach the Gospel, including what it is now fashionable to discredit as dogmas, and insisting on them with that force and authority which they should possess, he would be an apparition as unwelcome as surprising. Bishops of this type are not what Erastians want. They would be apt, in the nineteenth as in the first century, to turn the world upside down; and the one thing which these defenders of the Establishment want is to keep things as they are.

Bishop Thirlwall's retirement from the position he had so long filled with such credit to his own reputation for ability and moderation and sound judgment, followed so soon after by his lamented death, called forth such a chorus of praises from the men and journals of this party, that it might almost be supposed at first that he was their ideal prelate. Were he, however, to be described thus, some injustice would be done him, for the late Bishop of St. David's had some qualities which do not find favour in the eyes of these political religionists. The influences of his office had to some extent told upon him, and so far as they affected him, it had unquestionably been in the way of deterioration. Age, too, had produced its natural effect upon him, and the spirit of the times had been so greatly changed since his own early days, that even its Conservatism had almost reached the level of his youthful Liberalism. He was therefore able boldly to utter sentiments in the closing part of his career which would have exposed him to odium at its commencement; but it must not be forgotten that when courage was demanded, he showed himself equal to the necessities of the occasion, and did not hesitate to appear as the champion of unpopular causes—as, for example, when he advocated the admission of Dissenters to University degrees, at a time when such an opinion was regarded as rank heresy, especially when held and stoutly maintained by a leading member of one of the Universities.

It requires perhaps less courage in one holding the exalted position of a bishop to assert opinions which are offensive to the great majority of people, and, of course, as Liberal principles have attained supremacy, the advocacy of them has been less trying to those who are most sensitive to public opinion; but it is due to Dr. Thirlwall to say that it never seems to have been a matter of consideration with him whether his views would be popular or not. He may in some cases have shown more Conservative tendencies than might have been expected. The spell of the Establishment idea may have fallen upon him, as it is very likely to fall on those who have been trained amid its associations and over whom it had cast the enchantments of its dignities and rewards. It has happened that many of his utterances — calculated as they have been to moderate the violence of opposing parties, and suggesting those practical views so dear to a large class of Englishmen—have been extremely popular. But there is not the slightest reason to suspect his thorough conscientiousness in the formation of his opinions, or to imagine that he would have hesitated to express them, though he might by doing so have called forth that howl of disapprobation with which our press is too prone to receive utterances which do not accord with prevailing views. Manly independence, superiority to selfish considerations, elevation above the influence of popular passion or clerical prejudice, great clearness of thought and lucidity in exposition, always

characterised him, and were the chief elements of his strength. Had the current of public feeling been flowing in a different direction from that which it has taken during the last twenty years, these qualities would have made him intensely unpopular. It would have been remembered only that he was opposed to the compulsory use of the Athanasian Creed, or a supporter of Mr. Gladstone's action against the Irish Establishment, and he would have been condemned accordingly, with little, if any, recognition of the ability and calmness with which he had defended his cause. Liberal ideas have been predominant, and are so still, despite the Conservative reaction; and so Dr. Thirlwall, the enemy of sacerdotalism, the advocate of comprehensiveness, the exponent of a Liberal policy in Parliament and Convocation, though still a stout defender of the Establishment, has been popular. But it has never been his policy to swim with the tide, it has only been his good fortune that the tide has so often been with him; and if it had been his lot to breast it, there is abundant proof that he would have done it manfully, and that its utmost violence would not have turned him aside from the right.

This explains what at first seems rather a paradox, that one of the most influential and popular of our bishops—popular even amongst those who knew that in theological opinions between him and them there is a great gulf fixed—was nevertheless a courageous and independent man, who

thought out all questions for himself, who never bowed before the idols of party or of public opinion, who often held a position so far isolated that he was the keenest critic of the arguments and proceedings of those to whose proposals he had given the weight of his great influence. If it were not that clerical ways are like the "way of a serpent upon the rock," and the "way of a ship in the sea," among the things too wonderful for us, it would be a matter of amazement that his appointment to the episcopate did not excite the same opposition as was shown in relation to that of Dr. Hampden or of Dr. Temple. Even Lord Melbourne, with all his indifference to such matters, significantly asked, when he paid his formal visit after the appointment, "By the bye, Dr. Thirlwall, why did you translate that book of Schleiermacher's?" The translator of Schleiermacher might have been thought a more dangerous person than either the Bampton lecturer or the Essayist. But his nomination provoked no such angry hostility.

Very much of his power is due, of course, to that great intellectual force which extorted the reluctant admiration of those who are the furthest removed from sympathy with his opinions. It would be generally admitted that he was the greatest scholar among the bishops of his day—one who loved learning for its own sake, who had intermeddled with various departments of knowledge, and who made himself master of every

subject which he undertook to treat. His History of Greece was remarkable not only in itself, but because it was one of the first-fruits of the revival of classical scholarship among us, and because it exhibited the union of independent thinking with a high degree of scholarship. It emancipated the English mind from the thraldom of the idea which Mitford had so diligently instilled, and which misrepresented the whole of Grecian story, and it maintains its position still, despite the formidable rivalry of Grote's noble work, inferior to that great history in style and finish, but more reliable, because of its more unimpassioned tone and impartial temper.

A man, then, who had a greatness independent of his office, and a high literary reputation before he became a bishop, was sure to have weight, especially if his scholarship was not that of the recluse or of the partisan, but of the clear-headed, philosophical, practical thinker, who knew how to use his knowledge of the past as a guide in studying the problems of the present. Dr. Thirlwall's mind was eminently judicial, determined to look at all sides of a question, and examine every kind of evidence that might be available before pronouncing a deliverance—able to hold in restraint prejudices that might disturb the judgment, skilful in balancing antagonistic arguments, and assigning to all their proper place and weight. He was originally intended for the bar, and it can hardly be doubted that with such rare talents as he possessed he must have

attained great distinction, and would probably have reached one of the highest places on the Bench. His change of purpose was certainly unfortunate for the legal profession, which thereby lost a great ornament, and possibly for himself; for he would have found in it a congenial sphere, and would have sustained at the very highest level the well-earned fame of the most exalted judicial office. It would be easy to find numbers of men better fitted to be bishops; but had he become a chancellor or chief justice, Dr. Thirlwall might safely have challenged competition with the most distinguished luminaries of his day. His judicial character, however, recommended him to the sober and intelligent, though not very earnest men, who are kept in perpetual alarm by the strife of parties, who deprecate nothing so much as violence, who call everything which savours of strength of opinion and fervour of zeal violence, and who hail as a very Daniel one who can set forth so powerfully the reasonings on all sides as to suggest the conclusion, so welcome to this class of mind, that he must be very foolish who allows himself to show great earnestness on behalf of any. Dr. Thirlwall seldom failed to reach this ideal. It was not that he shrunk from taking a decided course, still less that he veiled his opinions in utterances of studied ambiguity, nor even that he bore very lightly upon those to whom he was opposed, but that he scrupulously avoided all exaggerations, scorned to descend to *ad captandum* platitudes, and supported

with a force all the stronger because of the calmness with which it was wielded, the conclusions he set forth, in language generally a model of clearness and condensation. He was no trimmer, but spoke decidedly on most of the great controversies which have distracted the Church during the eventful period of his episcopate, and never spoke without leaving his mark on the discussion. If his sympathies were not fervid, they were real and steady, and if his opinions were reached with great care, they were so consistent and definite that it was always easy to calculate where he would be found. Sacerdotalism has had no more dangerous foe, for no one has more thoroughly gauged its character, or could more easily and effectually dispose of its pretensions. The Broad Church school has had no more powerful ally, because he is one who has never pressed its conclusions too recklessly, while he has brought to the support of its views all the prestige of his great erudition. His Charges, extending over a period of thirty-two years, deal in frankest and most vigorous style with the questions which were being agitated at the time of their delivery, and are among the most valuable aids to an understanding of the ecclesiastical events of the time. Their breadth of view, their massive thought, their trenchant style, and their exhaustive treatment of the subjects under review, distinguish them from the majority of such episcopal productions. They are neither ephemeral nor superficial, but able exposi-

tions of great principles, which have bearings far beyond the range of the particular points on which they are brought to bear.

It was a strange irony of fortune which allotted such a man to a diocese in South Wales, which, though large in extent, and involving serious responsibilities and duties, was altogether unsuited for one of his calibre. It is hard to say what kind of bishop would suit Wales, or whether any bishop would be likely to win her people back from the Nonconformity in whose principles they have been trained, and to which they are so deeply attached; but it is easy to see that Dr. Thirlwall was one of the last men for the office. If he had been seated in Ely or Oxford, he could not have failed to be a very potent influence; but St. David's wanted an apostle, not a scholar—an enthusiast, not a moderator—one possessed with the passion of his office, not one who cultivated a philosophic superiority to passion of every kind. Perhaps the day may come when the Church of England will understand that it would be well for her highest good if all her bishops were of this type, but assuredly in Wales, where the work to be done is chiefly of a missionary character, men with the missionary spirit should be employed. This was not Dr. Thirlwall's temper any more than it was that of the bishops appointed by the earlier Whig administrations. They were liberal-minded, highly-cultured, scholarly men. The Stanleys, Hampdens, and others of the school whom our

Whig rulers delighted to honour, had a strong sense of their duty to the Church, and they conscientiously endeavoured to fulfil it; but their most devoted friends would not assert that they had apostolic zeal. It is not probable that any of their class could, with any fairness, have asked the question which was put in relation to a living bishop in one of the principal journals of his diocese: "When will the Bishop of —— begin to preach religion?" but it is certain that most of them attached comparatively small importance to the distinctive truths of the Gospel. The indifference to dogma has gone much further than they intended, but it can hardly be denied that the root of the evil is to be found in their teachings. How far the tendency was developed in Dr. Thirlwall it is not necessary to determine. His action on the "Essays and Reviews'" controversy sufficiently proves that its extreme manifestations did not command his sympathy, but at least it was strong enough to prevent him from making any impression on the Welsh mind. Indeed, by temperament and habits, as well as opinion, he was unsuited to the special work of the diocese, and though he ably discharged his official duties, it can hardly be maintained that his administration was effective.

A report, which was at one time current relative to the Bishop, gives a singular and not very satisfactory indication of the impression he had made on circles where something ought to have been known of his opinions. One of the latest

attacks upon Christianity is an anonymous work on "Supernatural Religion," which, in a courteous and apparently candid spirit, and with a considerable display of learning, undertakes the examination of the external evidences of revelation, and maintains that they are insufficient to verify its claims. This book was confidently said to be from the pen of Dr. Thirlwall. How such a rumour originated it is hard to say, for there is little if anything in it that could serve to identify it as his; and able as it unquestionably is, it is paying it too high a compliment to suggest that it is worthy of so accomplished a scholar. It was an idle piece of gossip, which was eagerly taken up by some of the large class to be found in London whose delight is to hear and to spread something new. The significant circumstance, however, is that it was not thought incredible. A more remarkable proof of the widespread belief in the disloyalty of some of the clergy to their own profession, than the credence given to a report that an aged bishop had deliberately sought to overthrow the faith of men in the Book to the teaching of which his life had been devoted, it is not easy to imagine. But, improbable as the tale seemed, impossible as it ought to have been pronounced by everyone who heard it, it was so generally accepted, that it was thought necessary to elicit a distinct and positive contradiction, which was given in such absolute terms as to preclude the possibility of its being questioned.

The report did the Bishop gross injustice. The

"Essays and Reviews" were hardly so pronounced as the book in question, some of them much less so, but he condemned them, and especially condemned them as the work of clergymen, in language which was not more severe than they deserved, but which at the time excited the astonishment of many who knew that his own orthodoxy had been impeached in earlier days. "What must become of Christianity," he says, "after its supernatural groundwork has been withdrawn from under it, I do not now inquire; but to maintain that the fundamental doctrines of the Church of England can survive that displacement, is a paradox which no ingenuity can reconcile with common sense." These pregnant words of one who cannot be accused of ignorance or narrowness, and who is perhaps as illustrious an example of culture as the Anglican Church of our day has been able to boast, cannot be too strongly emphasised. They ought to have protected him from any suspicion of having written a book with the distinct object of sweeping away the foundation to which he himself attaches so much value; unless, indeed, it be suggested that during the interval he has been gradually turning aside from the faith which, in previous years, had evidently been strengthening its hold upon him. But it is a favourite device of the Rationalist school to suggest that the more intelligent among Christian ministers do not believe what they are supposed to hold; and it must be confessed that the lax ideas as to the obligations of clerical subscription which have

been boldly maintained by men of high integrity have lent more countenance than was desirable to the idea. That Dr. Thirwall was fixed upon as one in relation to whom an allegation of this kind might be made, is due to the eminence of his scholarship and the known liberality of his views. But that liberality has not degenerated into indefiniteness, as may be gathered from his opinions of the scheme of comprehension advocated by the essayists: "The ideal sketched in this volume of a National Church, without a theology, without a confession, without a creed, with no other basis of united worship than a system of universal equivocation, has probably struck many with surprise at its extravagance. The scheme by which it is to be realised seems to exhibit an incongruity, almost amounting to opposition, between the means and the end. It aims at the cementing of religious unity by a process apparently tending to the most complete disintegration of all religious communion. It proposes to attract larger congregations to our services by extinguishing as much as possible the devotional element in them, and turning our churches into lecture-rooms, for the inculcation of ethical commonplace, as to which there is supposed to be no room for any difference of opinion in the audience."

It is not to be supposed from this that the Bishop would have narrowed the boundaries of the Church, but simply that he objected to a scheme of comprehension by which the Church would surrender every principle for which she was bound to

contend, and be content, in fact, *perdere vitam propter causas vivendi.* With his usual fairness, he urges strongly the injustice which such a plan would inflict upon a school with whom he had but little sympathy. Calvinists, or, as we should say, Evangelicals, would refuse to belong to a Church constituted on the Multitudinist principle, and "these Dissenters would include almost all the earnest religious feeling of the nation." The argument needs to be studied in full, not only to appreciate its force, but to see how far the Bishop was removed from the extreme Rationalism of the anonymous writer with whom, on insufficient grounds, or rather on no grounds at all, it has been sought to identify him. Perhaps there was not one of their censors whose criticisms were so much felt by the seven authors of the celebrated volume, partly because they were so unexpected from him, and still more because they were so telling in their very moderation and liberality. Dr. Rowland Williams, by whom some of the observations in the Charge of 1863 must have been specially felt, entered the lists as their champion; but he found, as did Mr. Malcolm Maccoll when he undertook to controvert the Bishop's views on the Athanasian Creed, that he was a very unpleasant adversary to meet, his perfect self-control and wide extent of knowledge, and great tact in presenting his arguments, giving him an immense advantage over his opponents.

Generous and liberal he always was, even when dealing with those whose action he most strongly

disapproved as wrong in principle and menacing the safety of the Establishment. Of the perils which threatened this institution, which he loved so well—and yet not with that blind devotion which is so characteristic of his school, and which, in the case of the Dean of Westminster, has become almost a mania, that prevents him from forming sound views on any question which is directly or remotely related to it—he had a very strong impression. The frequent warnings of danger which he gives in his Charges are not mere conventional expressions, still less are notes of alarm from one under the influence of panic, but the wise monitions of a far-seeing man, whom long experience, wide observation, and great insight, had raised to the character of a seer. "A Church," he said in the Charge of 1869, "may perish through decay of its vital forces; may shrivel up into a mere form, from which the spirit has fled, and for which nothing can be more desirable than that it should be swept away to make room for a living reality. But the spectacle of a Church going to wreck through the opposite cause, through an exuberance of vigour wasted in internal conflicts, is even more painful to contemplate." Feeling that this was "not a mere possibility, but a real and actually imminent danger," he sought to guard against it by labouring to correct error and yet pleading for liberty, so long as it was not abused to utter lawlessness and anarchy. His argument against Ritualism is as complete and effective as that against Rationalism; and he does

not hesitate, while rejoicing that in the case of Mr. Bennett the Judicial Committee were "enabled to avoid the necessity of investing the defendant with the halo of martyrdom," quietly, and as it seems with a half-suppressed sarcasm, to indicate the difficulty of justifying the principle of the judgment. Mr. Bennett "having expressed the same thought in two different forms of words—the one perfectly plain and simple, the other in the highest degree obscure and ambiguous—he was allowed the privilege of expounding that which was unmistakably erroneous by that which might mean anything or nothing." Condemnation need not be more emphatic; and so, no doubt, it was felt to be by those to whose remarkable decision it referred.

It was eminently characteristic of Bishop Thirlwall thus to criticise a procedure which, nevertheless, had his full approval. His genius is analytical rather than synthetical, and while his Charges reveal extraordinary critical power, there are no indications of an ability for construction. But his criticism was almost invariably as candid as it was searching, owing its caustic force entirely to its justice, not to the severity of his language. Only in dealing with Nonconformists did he seem to fall below his own high level. They expected a bishop, of course, to charge in favour of "religious instruction," but they hardly expected the Bishop of St. David's to adopt a tone worthy of his neighbour of Gloucester and Bristol. They did not suppose that he would admire what he calls the "secularist ideal," but they did not

think that, in the face of what Free Churches have done in providing for the religious wants of the people, he would have indulged in a sneer at "an abstraction which we call voluntary effort." The Principality, and his own diocese in particular, ought to have shown him the peril as well as the injustice of such a mode of attack. The retort is so obvious that we should have been surprised at the rashness which provoked it, were it not that any stick seems good enough with which to whip a Dissenter. It is the "abstraction called voluntary effort," not his State Church, which has saved Wales from practical heathenism; and it has thus justified its ability to undertake that work to which the Bishop thinks it so ludicrously unequal—the religious education of the young.

The Conservative influences of age and position evidently asserted themselves over the Bishop, and without venturing to pry into his secret history, it appeared as if a deeply religious tone had diffused itself over his spirit. Emotional he could never have become, but he seems to have grown in his devotion to Christian truth. As a Churchman he was more pronounced, and more opposed to Nonconformists; speaking strongly, as might have been expected, against our educational policy; condemning the Burials Bill as "one-sided and unjust," while conceding that there was a grievance that ought to be redressed; and even denying their right to a participation in the endowed schools of the country. Taken altogether, Dr. Thirlwall was

perhaps the greatest man who has sat on the Episcopal Bench in this generation. His mind was singularly well balanced as well as highly cultured. The extent and finish of his scholarship were not more remarkable than the singular equipoise of judgment for which he was distinguished. He was a Broad Churchman in the best sense of the word, not attaching himself to a particular school, and sometimes crossing the path of the "Broad" party in a manner that was hardly to have been expected from him. But though, of course, those who were disappointed in not having his sympathy, or perhaps annoyed at finding him opposed to them, were ready to charge him with timidity and time-serving, nothing could have been more unjust. A bishop who rebuked the *Record* for doing injustice to John Stuart Mill, in reference to an expression by which he had shocked numbers of men with wider sympathies than those of the *Record*, was certainly not lacking in courage. The editor of a recent volume of State Papers says of the Anglican Church: "Other faiths apply themselves to the feelings, emotions, and imaginations of men; this to their reason and conscience. Other Churches lay hold of the spiritual nature of man; this of his moral and utilitarian." If this be a true description, it would be hard to find a bishop more suited to his position than the great scholar and philosophic divine who was the late occupant of the throne of St. David's.

THE LATE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

IT is difficult to see how the genus ecclesiastic could ever have been developed in connection with the Church of Christ; but once called into existence, it is easy to understand how it has been perpetuated and has found representatives under very different forms of Church polity. The assumptions of the ecclesiastic are so contrary to the genius and spirit of the Gospel, the qualities which he cultivates so widely different from the graces of the Christian character, the authority he claims such an invasion of the rights of Christian men, and encroaches so far on the supreme rule of Christ Himself, that it might have been thought impossible that he could find a place in a Christian community. But when human nature had thus asserted itself, and the preachers of a religion, one of whose fundamental principles is that he who would be the greatest must be the minister of all, the servant of all, had once arrogated to themselves the functions of the priesthood, it was certain that there would be found

many to continue and enforce the claim. It is something like the Napoleon tradition. How it could have originated, or at least how it could ever have found any degree of acceptance, is hard to understand, but once endowed with vitality, it so flatters the vanity of the family, and especially of the individual in whom it is for the time being embodied, that it is not likely that it will be allowed to die out so long as a Bonaparte of any character and capacity remains to represent it. So, when the idea has once been conceived that there is an order of men in whom a supernatural authority which has been committed to the Church is vested, there will always be a large proportion of those who enter into the order eager to maintain and extend these exclusive prerogatives, in which they claim to have a share, and which cannot but minister to their own self-satisfaction.

The most serious peril of such a position is its influence upon the occupant, who of course never thinks it necessary to seek to check a feeling of pride or moderate his pretensions, because it is not a personal but an official sentiment he cherishes, and it is quite as much a duty as a pleasure to cultivate it. He lays claim to something very nearly approaching to infallibility, but it is as a minister of the Church and on the Church's behalf that he insists on maintaining the assumption. If he resents a disposition to oppose his authority and regards it as a revolt against Heaven, it is because he will not compromise the rights of the

Church which have been conferred on her by God Himself, and which her officers are bound to defend as a sacred trust which none must be allowed to invade. Men may esteem him proud, selfish, overbearing, but he must endure the reproach, and even welcome it as a testimony to his fidelity. How easily a man may deceive himself by such pleas, and fancy that he is justified in actions at which, were his own interests only at stake, he might hesitate, it is not necessary to point out.

The late Bishop of Winchester was one of the truest types of the ecclesiastic who has been seen on our Episcopal Bench for a very long time. The Church of Rome has always produced such men in abundance; but the Erastianism of the Anglican Establishment has done something to counteract the development of these hierarchical tendencies, or at least to prevent those in whom they are strongly marked from attaining high rank. A Hildebrand would not find favour with many English statesmen, and even those who might have personal sympathy with his aims would be slow to risk their own popularity and the peace of the country by giving him an opportunity for prosecuting his plans of ecclesiastical aggrandisement. Hence, though our bishops are all willing enough to magnify their own office and to claim the proper amount of deference for it, there are few of them who could be correctly described as strong champions of hierarchical claims. The Primate upholds to its fullest extent the dignity of his position, but it is as

the head of a great State organisation rather than as the representative of a spiritual body, invested with supernatural powers and rights. No one could accuse his brother at York of any failure to assert the authority which is supposed to belong to him, but he lacks that *soupçon* of priestly unction which is essential to the ideal ecclesiastic, and does not seem at all disposed to sink the individual even in the hierarch. But Dr. Samuel Wilberforce compensated for any such deficiency on the part of the two Primates, and never failed to make it understood that he claimed submission, not in virtue of the office to which he had been appointed by the State, but as one of the chief rulers of the Anglican branch of the Holy Catholic Church. He was an eloquent preacher and an able administrator, but he was before and above all else an ecclesiastic. Of the divine right of the Anglican Church, and of himself as one of its governors, he had as little doubt as of the great benefit which the nation would derive from absolute submission to so benign a sway.

According to the ecclesiastical idea, the great evil from which the country has suffered, ever since the days of the Reformation, has been the lowered tone of Church authority, and the disposition of those by whom it ought to have been upheld to connive at rebellion; and the first duty of all, but especially of the bishops, is to contend against the spirit of lawlessness which is abroad, both within and without the Church, and to restore a

power which has already been too much compromised, and which is still more seriously menaced, by the bolder movements of the present. The late Bishop of Winchester, while accepting this view in the main, sought to carry it out without sacrificing anything of the distinctive character of the Anglican Church. He knew as well as any man the strong Protestant sentiment of the nation, and the danger of arousing its sensitive jealousy; and he understood just as well how much of it is extremely unintelligent, and if it were only skilfully handled would let go the substance, if by the retention of the name and form it could be flattered into the belief that it still had not parted with an inheritance of whose real value it has so imperfect a comprehension. Throughout his episcopate he adopted a policy of conciliation rather than defiance. His aim was to make it clear how far High Churchism is removed from Romanism, or rather, how strongly it was opposed to it, and yet at the same time to inculcate principles which clear-sighted Protestants perceive to contain the essence of Romanism. An intense Catholic, he was a determined enemy of Papal pretensions. He thus endeavoured to preserve the advantages both of freedom and authority, the freedom being that which he and his Church were to enjoy, and the authority that which they were entitled to exercise over others.

If any man could have been equal to the task of resisting Ultramontanes on the one side and Rationalists on the other, both alike insisting

that if men are to be free at all they must be absolutely free to test everything, and that if there is authority anywhere, it resides in the Catholic Church and is embodied in the Pope, it was Dr. Samuel Wilberforce. In the first place, he had the great art of appearing absolutely unconscious of the weakness of his position, and laying down with the most perfect self-possession and confidence principles which in reality were contradictory of each other. If he insisted on the errors into which the Church of Rome has fallen, the voice was that of the freeman entering distinct protest against unjust usurpation. If he was exposing the evils of Dissent, or of Rationalism within the Church, there were some faint echoes of the anathemas with which Pius IX. had been accustomed to favour the world. They were, of course, not so terrible and denunciatory. They proceeded from an English episcopal palace, not from the Vatican, and were prepared by a Bishop who had mingled in the world and understood it as well as the Church, not by an old priest who has so long nurtured himself on illusions that he has come to believe in them. But the spirit was the same, if the form varied. They had a different tone even from that of Dr. Wordsworth's pastorals. No one could suppose that he was more liberal than his brother of Lincoln, but he would seldom commit himself in the same way. Dr. Wilberforce was far too astute to speak of Dissenters as Pius IX. does of heretics, or even as Dr. Wordsworth is continually doing of Wesleyans, but he had much

the same feeling as to the guilt of their rebellion, and just the same desire to put it down; and though he spoke in more honied accents, there was the same lofty assumption of an authority which it is impossible to challenge without sin.

That his Church may herself have committed schism, or that she can be acquitted of it only by a reasoning which is equally available for those Dissenters whom he was so ready to brand as schismatics, was a thought which, if it occurred to him at all, was not allowed to ruffle his spirit or to disturb that sublime confidence with which he advanced his pretensions. This itself was a strong point in his favour, and when with it was combined a remarkable subtlety of thought and felicity of expression, which enabled him to conceal the weak points of his case, it is not too much to say that if any man could have maintained such a position it was the late Bishop. But he failed to do it. He no doubt gained for himself great influence and prestige, which, however, he has won only by his distinguished abilities and wonderful policy and tact, and did not at all imply the triumph of his opinions. He was not able to mould Church movements according to his own ideas, to restrain the excessive developments of the party with whom he was supposed to be most in sympathy, or to avert the progress even in his own Church of the rationalising tendencies which he naturally regarded with so much alarm, but which, from the sheer lack of capacity to appreciate their strength, he could do

nothing to check. In his later years he must have looked on the disturbed and distracted state of the Church, the disappointment of the hopes which he once cherished, the extravagance of those whom he would fain have influenced by moderating counsels—by giving heed to which they might more certainly have attained the end in view—and the peril in which the Establishment was placed by the spirit of resistance that the unwisdom of which he warned them was exciting in the country, with a feeling of sadness. Ritualism had gone far ahead of him, and its extremes must have been more annoying to him, even than to prelates who were more opposed to its distinctive principles. They might hope that these extravagances would create a reaction which would be fatal to the designs of the party; but he must have feared that when it came it would sweep away principles which were specially dear to him, and which it had been the great business of his life to enforce.

Very early in the Ritualistic movement he gave his views as to its dangers in an address to candidates for ordination, which is marked by his usual caution and practical judgment. After warning his hearers against the adoption of that style of clerical dress, of which the "M.B." waistcoat is the familiar type, he added, with great truth and wisdom, that "many a young clergyman, who might have preached Christ and spread the life of His Church throughout a parish around him, has marred all his usefulness, and raised a host of

enemies, by the straightness of his collar or the length of his skirt." "More harm," he adds, "has I believe, been done amongst us by such attempts to restore a ritual to which our people are unaccustomed, than by any other single error." The deliverance was eminently characteristic, and was a sufficient index to the whole of his conduct towards Ritualism. No one could suppose that he was averse either to its pomp and show, or to the special ideas which the rites are intended to symbolise. His whole aim had been to familiarise the minds of the people with the ideas which Ritualism inculcates, and, so far as he could go with wisdom, to introduce a higher style of ceremonial. What he deprecated were all innovations calculated to excite the suspicions of the people, and provoke an opposition which might be dangerous. As the result, he pointed with satisfaction, when leaving Oxford for Winchester, to the absence of Ritualism from his diocese. Strange and startling as such a statement might seem to many, it was perfectly intelligible to those who had carefully studied the Bishop and understood his principles and aims. Ritualism, though only the natural outgrowth of such High-Churchism as his, was really one of its most dangerous enemies. By its more uncompromising character, and its more honest and complete development of its principles, it showed the people what the tendencies of the system really were. It was rash, reckless of consequences, intemperate, and, last but not least, not very respectful to bishops.

Hence a Bishop who did not hesitate to accept a crozier from admiring friends, even to be photographed with it, always set himself against the use of the priestly vestments, and the rites with which their use is associated; and while he thoroughly Anglicised a diocese, boasted that he saved it from Ritualism.

If he was not able to accomplish the same result in Winchester, it may be said that he had not time for the working out of his plans. Still, despite the marvellous personal influence he could always command, it may be doubted whether the difficulties would not have been too great even for him. The truth is, the movement against which he had been struggling had become so strong, that it was very improbable he would have repeated the success he achieved at Oxford. Even he might have found that the High-Churchism he represented has no firm hold upon the Church at large, and must share the fate of all movements which are not true to their own principles. There was nothing, however, to indicate that he meant to rub down excesses which were as extreme in Winchester as in any diocese in the kingdom. When Mr. Maguire was announced to lecture in defence of Protestantism, his lordship could take prompt and resolute action; but he never gave any signs of his intention to interfere with the scarcely-disguised Romanism which was pushing its advances on every side.

Dr. Wilberforce succeeded to a decided Evangelical,

and no doubt found a wide field for work very congenial to his taste in seeking to correct what in his view were the errors of administration under which a very low style of church ceremonial had prevailed in many parishes, and, short as was the period of his episcopate, there were abundant evidences that the clergy were fully conscious of the change that had taken place. Evangelicals, of course, understood that they would have but little encouragement from their new chief, unless they were prepared to adapt themselves to the changed circumstances and show themselves better Churchmen, and some of them at once began to conform to his views. But whether the Bishop's ideas about Ritualism had been modified, or whether he found it necessary to exercise more caution with a party who had become so powerful, certain it is that he who boasted that he had kept it out of Oxford, suffered it to grow and flourish in Winchester. It is not to be assumed that such a change of policy implied any advance in his own ecclesiastical principles. It was important chiefly as showing a change of his view as to the state of public opinion. He discountenanced Ritualism because he thought it unsafe, not because he thought it wrong. Is it too much to conclude that if he dealt with it more leniently, even tolerated it in developments more pronounced than ever, it was because he thought that the national mind was ready to bear another advance in the "Catholic" direction?

It was unfortunate for the Bishop that he had

acquired a reputation for excessive subtlety. He was not in any true sense a Trimmer, for he had fixed convictions and definite aims, which he was bent on accomplishing. The common opinion of him was, that in his efforts to accomplish them he was sometimes betrayed into a crooked policy. It is the tendency of the ecclesiastic to fancy that an end so holy as that which he pursues will itself sanctify the means; and possibly the Bishop may not have wholly escaped from its influence. He was so wary and cautious, both in word and deed; he understood men so well, and showed so much tact in his dealings with them; he could be so strong on points where public opinion justified decision, and so temperate where vehemence would only excite antagonism; he knew so accurately when and how to bend, and how far it was safe to press ecclesiastical pretensions; he always contrived to steer his course so skilfully, and still to glide on in defiance of all kinds of opposing currents and adverse criticism, that it was not surprising if he had the credit of a diplomacy only too astute and flexible. What he was and what he meant all the world understood, but not the less did he seek, where he thought it desirable, to conciliate those whom he knew to be inveterate opponents by the assumption of friendliness. He would sometimes meet individual Dissenters with all the love and kindness of a brother, and address them with a suavity and effusive courtesy which would have deceived any but the most wary. It was thus he

charmed Mr. Binney, when he met him at a city banquet. Putting his arm in that of the veteran Nonconformist, he said, "Come, Binney, we were old neighbours in the Isle of Wight." Mr. Binney was just the man to be moved by such a procedure; but he could not be ignorant of the light in which he and his Church were regarded by his fascinating companion. It was not a phase of character to be admired in a bishop, but it revealed the true spirit of the ecclesiastic. It was, however, a mistake in policy, for it did not neutralise the feelings which his antagonistic utterances awakened, but rather exposed him to a suspicion of duplicity.

How far this is just, is a question which will always remain open. He had to reconcile opposing tendencies in his own nature as well as contending parties in the Church, and this alone may have created an impression unfavourable to his integrity. He had two sides, at all events, as a theologian. It is a melancholy thing that the sons of so decided an Evangelical as William Wilberforce should have departed so far from the principles of their father; and numbers may think that the Bishop would have acted more consistently, and have done less harm to Protestantism, if he had taken the same course as his brothers, and reconciled himself with that Church which, if there be such authority vested in the Catholic Church as he claimed for it, is its only legitimate representative. But the truth was, the old Evangelical leaven never was altogether purged out. At all events, some of his sermons

contain very clear and beautiful expositions of the doctrines of the Gospel. To reconcile their teaching with that of others, in which he insists on the efficacy of the sacraments and the rights of the Church, is happily not our business. Possibly he was able to do it to his own satisfaction, but the impression which this apparent contrariety sometimes produced on the mind of others gave strangers an idea of the man which, though perfectly natural, was probably unjust.

An incident which came to my own knowledge illustrates this. I had it from the brother of one of the parties, and its authenticity may be relied on. A Nonconformist happened to be visiting in a town of his first diocese when the Bishop came to preach there, and went to hear him. In the morning the service was in a church whose clergyman was decidedly High, and the Bishop's sermon was adapted to the atmosphere of the place. It was clear, eloquent, and impressive, but it was a strong assertion of the rights of the Church and the danger of resisting them. "A splendid sermon," was the observation of a companion, himself a Churchman, to the Dissenting visitor, "a splendid sermon; but, if it be true, there is no hope for you." Despite so painful a conclusion, however, the Nonconformist had been so charmed by the preacher that he resolved to hear him again in the evening. On this occasion the service was in an Evangelical church: the tone of the preacher was varied accordingly, and the sermon was as simply Evangelical and

liberal as it was powerful and touching. "I do not know now," said the Churchman to his Dissenting friend, as they left the place, "what may be in store for you, but there can be no hope for him." Not only was the judgment unduly harsh, but the suggestion that his lordship was insincere either on one occasion or the other was that of a partisan. Still, it is certain that incidents of this character did much to lower his influence, and to provoke a condemnation which a fuller knowledge of the man might have reversed. There are apparent inconsistencies in men, the secret of which they alone understand; and, happily for us as well as for them, the judgment does not belong to us. No two things seem so irreconcilable as a simple faith in the Gospel and a belief either in ecclesiastical authority or sacramental efficacy; but there are men who appear to have solved a problem to us absolutely insoluble and hold firmly by both, and the Bishop of Winchester appeared to be one. His influence was not the less, but all the more pernicious on that account; for his Evangelical utterances gave him a power over minds which otherwise he would have been unable to affect at all, but it would be unfair to assume that he ever acted a part.

There are few characters more difficult to understand by the great mass of men, more especially if they happen to be influenced by party feelings, than those who, to versatility of genius, unite a sympathetic temperament—who have the power

of adapting themselves not only to different classes of society, but to varieties of opinion—who are at home under all circumstances, and are able to speak in all dialects. Their susceptible natures can pass rapidly from one class of feelings to another, as successive influences are brought to play upon them, in a way which men cast in a different mould cannot comprehend and are apt to misjudge. This was pre-eminently the case with Samuel Wilberforce. His powers were very varied, and his ability of so accommodating himself to the society into which he was brought, as to throw a charm over all who came in contact with him, almost unequalled. He was an indefatigable parish priest, a laborious bishop, who, for force of character and administrative skill, has had no equal in his day; a powerful speaker in the House of Lords, at the Convocation, and wherever he went was felt to be a chief among men. Had he chosen a parliamentary career, he must have been a leader—might perhaps have commanded the highest honours of the State. It would not have been easy to place him in a position to which he would not have been equal. At the dinner of a City Company, where he was expected only to talk pleasant nothings, flattering to the self-love of his hosts, or at a gathering of working-men where he had to disarm prejudice and excite sympathy on behalf of a Church they had been wont to regard with indifference if not with aversion; addressing a company of rustics on the

great themes which gave his ministry a dignity and value which no State privileges and honours could confer, or preaching in the University pulpit to those keen and inquiring intellects, which he felt at once so important and so difficult to influence aright; in committee, when seeking to conciliate men of different parties, and while doing it to serve his own order as well as to advance the special object in view; or in debate, when seeking to overcome some powerful opponent and stir the feelings of an audience as fastidious and as unimpressible as the House of Lords—he was equally master of the situation. He was subtle in argument or brilliant in rhetoric; he could be sparkling and witty, or unctuous and impressive; he could use the language of common life or of the schools, just as occasion demanded. What was more, he seldom failed to perceive what it was that the occasion required, for to all his other gifts he added that subtle instinct which we call tact, so impossible to acquire, so invaluable wherever it is possessed.

His training had helped to develop this many-sidedness. With the views and principles of the Evangelical school he had become familiar in his father's house, where he must also have been brought into contact with some of the leading politicians of a former generation. William Wilberforce himself had not only a rare sweetness of disposition, but something also of that tact which was afterwards so conspicuous in his distinguished

son. An anecdote, told in Macaulay's biography, illustrates this. Mr. Wilberforce had begged Fox not to publish a paper in which "mention was made of Mr. Pitt having been employed at a club in a manner which would have created scandal." Having agreed to the request, Fox said, "Now, Mr. Wilberforce, if instead of being about Mr. Pitt, this had been an account of my being seen at White's on a Sunday, would you have taken so great pains to prevent it being known?" The question was a trying one for a man who was at once the model of politeness and the soul of truth. But Wilberforce was equal to the occasion. "I asked this," said Mr. Fox, "because I wanted to see what he would say, for I knew he would not tell a lie about it. He threw himself back, as his way was, and only answered, 'Oh, Mr. Fox, you are always so pleasant!'" His son could not have shown himself a better tactician.

But, even in early life, the Bishop did not follow closely in his father's steps. At Oxford he was a Liberal, and distinguished himself at the Union by speeches in support of proposals of a decidedly advanced character; as, for example, in favour of the dethronement of Charles I., in vindication of John Hampden, and in opposition to borough-mongering. What is more extraordinary, he joined the society in which John Stuart Mill was a leader, and which numbered among its members Macaulay, Thirlwall, Poulett, Thomson, the two Bulwers, Fonblanque, and other Liberals.

He was thus accustomed to look at the different sides of a subject, and must have been much less open to impression if he had not been influenced by such a training. Thus, while the ecclesiastical idea dominated in his mind, he had been prepared to take much wider views than are common with those whose training had been more exclusive in its character. He knew the world as well as the Church, and was fully alive to the aspect which the one presented to the other. These were dangerous gifts to the man himself, perhaps unconsciously betraying him into the adoption of a policy which, to all who did not understand him, was sure to seem lacking in simplicity and straightforwardness. His position in an Establishment abounding in anomalies, and often demanding the exercise of considerable strategy on the part of its rulers in order to keep the vessel from the shoals and quicksands by which its course is beset, must have helped to develop still further the genius for diplomacy which he possessed, and his exercise of which exposed him to censures so severe from different quarters.

But the best testimony to the real worth which underlay a superficial appearance of insincerity, is the hearty affection which he won from many who had the best opportunities of knowing his true character. "Take his life and work as a whole," says Canon Liddon, in a singularly eloquent panegyric he pronounced upon him, "and let me dare to say, in virtue of the long friendship with which

he honoured me, that it was penetrated throughout with a sincerity of purpose." This is very strong evidence, and though it may be said it comes from a partial friend, it must not be discredited on that account. Indeed, the fact that he was able to retain the close friendship and intense admiration of a man like Canon Liddon itself tells in his favour. The Canon was not ignorant of the features of character which, as he admits, made him in the eyes of many "a standing paradox," and it was his own more intimate knowledge that led him to protest against a judgment which he had found to be not only needlessly harsh, but altogether mistaken.

Having said this, it is fair to those who held an adverse opinion to add, that it was singularly unfortunate for the Bishop that, on more than one occasion when his friends had most counted on his aid, he was found singularly wanting. His conduct in supporting the Canadian Clergy Reserves Bill, in abandoning opposition to Irish Disestablishment, and in relation to Dr. Hampden's appointment, against which he first protested—although, on his own confession, he had not at the time when he signed the celebrated episcopal remonstrance, read the book on which it was based—and then so far sanctioned, that he refused to allow a suit against the Doctor for his alleged heresy, could not fail to excite angry animadversion. Possibly, he could justify his action on all these points to his own conscience, but it wore an ugly appearance to the

world outside, and was not likely to be leniently judged by those who felt that the support on which they had been resting had proved a broken reed, which had pierced their own hands. Of the strength of feeling which his conduct provoked, there was a remarkable illustration in the debate on the Canadian Clergy Reserves Bill, on which occasion Lord Derby said: "When the Right Reverend Prelate tells me that it is impossible for him to say anything offensive because he has a smiling face, he will forgive me if I quote in his presence from a well-known writer, without intending in the least to apply the words to him—

'A man may smile, and smile and be a villain.'"

The scene that followed was in strange contrast with the ordinary decorum of the House of Lords. Lord Clarendon shouted, we are told, in a voice of thunder, "Oh! oh!" and to Lord Derby's inquiry, who was the peer with nerves so delicate, rose to protest "against any noble lord applying, even in the language of poetry, the epithet of villain to any member in the House; most of all do I deprecate the use of such an expression by a lay peer towards a right reverend prelate." A Whig earl defending a bishop against the Tory earl, was a new thing on the earth. At first it seemed as if the excitement would not easily subside. But Lord Derby soon regained his self-control, and when Lord Clarendon took a glass of water to cool himself, immediately took another, and called out across the table, "Your

health, Clarendon," so ending the difficulty which the doubts about Bishop Wilberforce's loyalty had created. It is hardly possible, however, to explain it, when it is remembered that by his firm and uncompromising attitude on other questions, such as the revival of Convocation and the opposition to the Divorce Bill, he threw away any advantage which an unworthy compliance with the wishes of those in authority might have secured him. Despite these aberrations, as they must appear to all who looked up to him as a champion of the Church, her doctrines, and her rights, his course was not that of a man who in a State like ours was intent solely or chiefly on personal advancement. Is not the solution of these apparent inconsistencies to be found in his tendency to be too diplomatic in his care for the interests of the Establishment? "Certainly," says one of his warm but discriminating admirers, "he piqued himself (a little overmuch) on political foresight." Nothing is more certain to lead a man into tortuous courses, and yet, after all, he may have had no other end but the strengthening of his beloved Anglicanism, which certainly never had a more devout believer in its claims, or a more zealous defender of its rights, or a more earnest worker for its extension.

But the Anglican system is itself one great inconsistency, and his attachment to it goes far to explain the misconstructions from which he suffered. When he opposed the Papal aggression, or when, as in his very last speech in the House of Lords,

he indignantly repudiated all sympathy with Rome, earnest Protestants listened with astonishment, not unmixed with indignation, to what they thought hollow, if not hypocritical, professions. They remembered his High Church teachings and practices, and they fancied that he was only indulging in such talk in order to calm popular apprehensions, and so enable the party over which he threw his protection the better to pursue their insidious designs against Protestantism. But the Bishop was perfectly sincere. The Protean character of his advocacy was only a reflection of the spirit of the system of which he was the exponent. It is his critics rather who deceive themselves in supposing that Anglicanism is pure Protestantism.

There are points in which Samuel Wilberforce reminds one of Norman Macleod, though of course with very marked differences. They were alike in this, that in both there was so much of humanness as to cause them to be often misunderstood, and such a many-sidedness, that those who cannot comprehend this quality, were sure to form erroneous estimates. To many, Norman Macleod was a man of bright, joyous, somewhat rollicking nature, who was not very sound in his theology, and was too careless of the conventionalism of clerical life, and who had been to a considerable extent spoiled by society. Now that they are able to know him more intimately and more truly through the records of a diary, every page of which bears the stamp of perfect candour and truth, they must, if they have

true hearts at all, repent of the hasty judgments they so heedlessly pronounced. This man, who was thought to have so little of strong spiritual feeling, is now seen to have been full of religious intensity, one who wrestled and wept in secret before his God, and whose one thought and desire was to make his life a power in Christ's service. It was his very simplicity and truth which caused the mistake into which so many fell about him. He yielded to the strong impulses of the hour, without stopping to ask what the world would think or say about him, and in the spirit which is only too common, numbers supposed that this phase of his character revealed the entire man. So must it have been, if we are to trust the evidence of his friends, with Samuel Wilberforce. The brilliant talker, who could delight any circle by his sparkling *bon mots*, did yet impress his clergy, when they met him in solemn conference, with the depth of his piety and the earnestness of his devotion to the work. That men of tamer spirit and more commonplace nature should not be able to understand how he was as real in the one case as the other, and that the charming *abandon* of social life was as consistent with his profession as the graver moods of more sacred season, is not wonderful. But injustice would be done to all men of noble nature, and especially of many-sided character, if they were to be judged on such principles.

It is asking too much, however, when Canon Liddon invites us to see in Bishop Wilberforce one

who, beyond most others, resembled the Apostle Paul—at all events, "in one significant respect." The idea of the Apostle Paul as an Anglican bishop, watching the ebb and flow of political feeling in the hope of turning them to the service of the Establishment, is a sufficiently startling one; and whatever may be thought of "the strength, the tenderness, and the versatility of the Bishop's humanity," the wisdom of suggesting that "in his power of becoming all things to all men, that he might by all means save some," he resembled the Apostle Paul, may well be questioned. Place the two lives side by side, and they suggest contrast rather than resemblance.

So, too, when a Quarterly Reviewer says, that "if ever there was man or bishop who fulfilled the apostolic injunction to endure hardness (and that in many forms), that bishop was Samuel Wilberforce," he gives rather a singular turn to the Apostle's language. The Bishop's was not what could fairly be called a hard life. Incessant toil and anxious thought undoubtedly he had. He was a leader in ecclesiastical politics, and a great administrator of a diocese. He was ready for every labour which seemed to him necessary to the success of the great undertaking to which he had devoted his life—the strengthening and extension of the Anglican Church. But this is surely a very different kind of hardness from that which Paul enjoined Timothy, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, to cultivate and manifest. In short, if the

Bishop's critics are unfair when they impeach his sincerity, his admiring friends are equally unwise when they hold him up as an example of saintly, if not of apostolic, devotion. He was a singularly able man, with sympathies as large as his intellectual powers were versatile. In the singleness of his aim and the abundance of his labours, he was a model bishop; and if the highest object a Christian can pursue is to make Anglicanism supreme in the nation, and the bishop supreme in Anglicanism, he deserves the highest praise. But to go beyond this, and to ask the world to see in him a reproduction of the apostolic spirit, is to ask it to ignore altogether some of the most salient features in his character and the most memorable incidents in his life.

The melancholy circumstances of his death served to exhibit in a very striking way the importance of the position which he filled. Its awful suddenness and painful surroundings were, after the first shock was past, almost forgotten in the sense of the greatness of the loss which the Church had sustained. This was not wonderful, for Samuel Wilberforce was, at the time of his death, the most influential ecclesiastic of the day. Circumstances had barred his way to the throne of Canterbury; but the Archbishop was not really so important a personage as the great suffragan, who, either from a salutary fear entertained by statesmen of trusting the power of the Primacy in such hands, or (as rumour said) in consequence of feelings excited by the secession of members of his family to Rome, was obliged to

content himself with the See of Winchester. Even the incidents connected with his death were indications of the great influence which he exerted. Great as are the charms of Dorking and the adjoining district, it is not going too far to assume that they alone would not have been sufficient to account for the gathering of such illustrious guests as were to have met under the hospitable roof of Mr. Leveson Gower, on the memorable Saturday afternoon which took from the Anglican Church her most distinguished prelate. Still less is it possible to doubt that in any discussion on public affairs which might have arisen, the persuasive reasonings of the Bishop, enforced in his own fascinating style, would tell for a great deal. Whether it was in the interests of progress that a Liberal ministry should have been so much under such influence, is a very different question; but about its existence there could be no dispute.

He was just as powerful among ecclesiastics as among politicians. The blundering of the bishops ever since his death is an indirect but convincing testimony to his remarkable power. It is easy to understand how clear-headed Churchmen, disgusted with the exhibitions of utter feebleness on the part of the Episcopal Bench during the whole of the proceedings on the Public Worship Act, have been ready again and again to cry out, in the bitterness of their soul, for but one hour of Samuel Wilberforce! He may not have been the greatest ornament his Church has had in his day, but he was certainly her wisest director. His most fervid admirer might

hesitate to say that he was the most eloquent preacher the Church has produced in our time, seeing that Robertson was among his earlier, and Liddon among his later, contemporaries. As a theologian, he was confessedly inferior, if not superficial; but as an ecclesiastical statesman and administrator he was unapproached. Thirlwall had a wider sweep of vision; but he had not the practical qualities which made Wilberforce so powerful, and caused his loss to be so severely felt.

Turning from the quality to the results of his work, what traces has this powerful orator, this persuasive and stirring preacher, this indefatigable worker, this greatest of modern bishops, produced upon the religious life of the country, and upon the character of his own Church? That that Church has passed through a revolution during the period of his activity, and is a different institution to-day from what it was when he commenced his labours, is apparent to all but the most superficial observers. How far was he an instrument in producing it? The answer which would be given by numbers would be prompt and decided. They would point to the style of his preaching, to the character of the institutions which he established in the Oxford diocese, and to the influence of which Cuddesdon was the fountain, as infallible proofs that no man was more responsible for a development of High Church principles, which bodes ill to the Protestantism of the nation, than the late Bishop. In the interview of the Evangelical memorialists with the

Primate in 1873, when he told them that there was not a bishop on the Bench disloyal to the principles of Protestantism, dissent was immediately expressed as to Dr. Wilberforce, and the dissentients gave voice to a very prevalent opinion. They were right, and they were wrong. He was not a Protestant in their sense, and yet it is possible that he was as much of a Protestant as the formularies of the Church require. They obeyed a true instinct in regarding him as their most formidable opponent. Though an opponent of Ritualism, it is doubtful whether a bishop who was more in sympathy with its views could have done it as much service. But in condemning him, were not the memorialists really condemning their own Church? He held an Evangelical creed in combination with sacerdotal principles. Does not even the Prayer-Book the same? Do not the same apparent inconsistencies which were found in him appear also in the formularies? If he is indefensible, what is to be said about Anglicanism, of which he was one of the truest embodiments? It is far easier to declaim against him than to point out a case in which he was unfaithful to the teachings or disobedient to the rubrics of his Church; and if that be so, the censures of those who adhere to the Church ought certainly to be stopped. They may dislike the changes that have occurred, and the late Bishop as one of their great promoters; but their anger ought rather to be turned on the Prayer-Book, whose spirit he seems, on the whole, to have so faithfully expressed.

Of the numerous stories illustrative of his cleverness which are afloat, one may be selected with which to close this sketch. It may possibly only be one of those mythological anecdotes which seem naturally to gather round eminent men; but it certainly ought to be true. In the crowd of some State ceremonial his lordship had the misfortune to tread on the train of Mrs. Tait. His apologies were made with that finished courtesy for which he was well known, and closed with the excuse, "You see, we bishops are always treading on the skirts of Canterbury." Be it true or false, it was fortunate for the Establishment that beyond the skirts of Canterbury his lordship never did advance. A man of ecclesiastical ideas so advanced, ability so distinguished, and skill so adroit, at the head of the Anglican Church would have been a standing menace, first to Anglican Protestantism and then to the Establishment, which continues to exist because the people still believe it Protestant.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

THE Bishop of London ought to be one of the leading men of the Establishment. As its official representative in the metropolis, as the head of the most important and rapidly increasing diocese in the kingdom, as, up till the passing of the Judicature Act, one of the prelates entitled to a seat on the Judicial Committee, his position is second only to that of the Primate himself, and being somewhat more free to act than one burdened with the responsibility which rests on his Grace of Canterbury, he has the opportunity of rendering the Church even more efficient service. What a prelate, presiding over a metropolitan see, can accomplish by virtue of distinguished ability and untiring energy, may be seen in the case of Dr. Manning. It may be said, and not without truth, that he is rather too anxious to keep himself before the eye of the public, too eager to make his voice heard on any or every question that may arise, altogether too self-assertive and presumptuous; but it is not the less certain that the very pertinacity

with which he presses his claims, and the eagerness with which he rushes to the front in every great public movement, have told to the advantage of his Church. He knows that he has to contend against a storm of unpopularity, and he resolves fearlessly to breast it. It is his duty to insist on obnoxious pretensions and to hold up the errors most repulsive to the English mind as established truth, and he endeavours to compensate for the disadvantages of his position by the confidence with which he propounds his views—although he knows them to be regarded by the world as self-evident absurdities—and by the constancy with which, in season and out of season, he seeks to disseminate them. In the view of many, and those of a class he must be most anxious to conciliate, there seems to be a restlessness which is sadly lacking in dignity, and an apparent love of prominence in some of his proceedings which is essentially vulgar. But it must be supposed that he has calculated the effect of his own actions, and, as his aim is simply to advance the interests of his Church, he does not trouble himself as to the impression which a line of conduct that he considers necessary to this end may produce upon the more cultured class. His policy has been so far successful that it has secured him a position and influence far beyond what a Romish archbishop of twenty, or even ten, years ago could have expected to obtain. He is found at most public gatherings, whether of a literary or philanthropic character,

and the place which he has quietly assumed is beginning to be accorded to him. In short, he is a power, working, and working with great ability, at the centre of action, on behalf of Rome, and a power which, if the Established Church is to maintain her ground, needs to be counteracted by the presence of a prelate as strong as himself, one with purpose as single, with principles as clearly defined, and with an equal capacity for understanding the signs of the times and dealing with them.

While the Bishop of London is the man to whom the world naturally looks for the discharge of this duty, the peculiar circumstances of his diocese render it additionally important that he should be able to guide and rule with wisdom and firmness. It is bad enough to have to encounter so able and subtle a rival representing the Romish Church, but it is far more difficult to have to manage his own clergy, who, in his cathedral, and in not a few churches, are labouring to extend anti-Protestant ideas, and doing the work of Rome more effectively even than Archbishop Manning's priests. The Ritualists have a profound and, to some extent, a just belief in the importance of securing influence in a metropolis, and, guided by the same principles which have made the "S. P. G." so persistent in its endeavours to place a Bishop in the capital of Madagascar, they have concentrated much of their force at London. There are, indeed, some eminent leaders of the party, such as Archdeacon Denison and Mr. Bennett, in the country, while Dr. Pusey,

Canon Bright, and some fellow-labourers, seek to uphold its influence at the University which was the *fons et origo mali;* but London is the true centre of the movement, and it is there it requires to be vigorously and effectively met. Mr. Mackonochie's extravagances would hardly have attracted so much attention, or assumed so much importance, if they had been carried on in the parish church of Frome; or, at least, if it had only been in a comparatively obscure place that they had been attempted, they might have been treated as individual eccentricities. Mr. Bennett himself ostentatiously avows that in his service there are all the most obnoxious features of the St. Alban's ritual, but they have not involved him in legal proceedings, nor can it be said as a reason for this that the thing was done in a corner, and therefore unnoticed. He himself has dragged it to the light of day, neither attempting to conceal the facts nor to deny their significance. "I," he says, in language which seems as if intended to challenge prosecution, "am one of those who burn lighted candlas at the altar in the daytime; who use incense at the Holy Sacrifice; who use the eucharistic vestments; who elevate the blessed Sacrament; who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, Christ present in the Sacrament, under the form of bread and wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Yet Mr. Bennett was spared, while Mr. Mackonochie was prosecuted; for when action was taken against

him, it was not for the ceremonies which he practised in his distant country church, but for the doctrine which he taught, and even as to this, the offence charged was its publication in the diocese of London, not its enforcement in his own pulpit.

This alone is sufficient, if any proof be necessary, to show how highly both parties estimate the attainment of a strong position in London. Possibly some of the Ritualist innovations may have been first introduced in some humble country parish; but it is not till they have established themselves in the metropolis that they can be regarded as having won a place in the Establishment. It is in London, of course, that the literary representatives of the school, men like Dr. Littledale, Dr. Lee, Mr. Orby Shipley, and others, who are serving it with great ability, if with a zeal which, in its fervour, often transgresses the bounds alike of prudence and charity, congregate, and seek to extend its power, not only by means of their publications like the *Church Times* and the *Church Review* (which, however, are likely rather to hinder than to promote its cause in the eyes of all intelligent men), but by what is much more likely to be successful, their social position. It is there, too, that the most celebrated churches of the school are found, and neither cost nor labour is spared to make their service imposing and attractive both to the citizens and the provincial visitors. What is done in the great city, of course, attracts attention all over the country, and a victory won there exercises a national influence. It is

possible, no doubt, to affect the centre from the extremities; but this is always a long and difficult process, and the Ritualists have shown themselves good strategists in striking strongly and decisively at the centre.

In this state of things, the Ritualistic struggle must of necessity occupy a considerable share of the attention of the Bishop of London, and a power to deal wisely with it is one of the most necessary qualifications for the office. A friend of the Establishment would desiderate for such a position a man of commanding intellect and resolute will, with distinct convictions, and yet without pronounced party sympathies, whose high abilities and eminent services to the Church were sufficient to secure for him general submission, and who was so far removed above all suspicion of partiality, that his assertion of episcopal authority would command respect even from the party on whom it might press most severely. The interests of the Establishment certainly demand that a bishop who has to deal with an element so powerful and so unruly as the Ritualistic party in the metropolis, should be a man of broad views and statesmanlike spirit, who knows how to temper firmness with conciliation, and yet can so act as not to allow his concessions to be attributed to hesitation or weakness.

The most fervid admirer of Dr. Jackson would hardly pretend that he answers to this ideal. He is very far from being a violent partisan. Indeed, he may fairly be classed among the division which Dr.

Littledale would designate as "neutrals," but which might more probably be described as the "correct Church;" and even in the advocacy of its views he has shown a moderation which is almost judicial, and which might have been judicious if he had lived in more quiet times, or filled a less responsible position. At present, however, the Establishment does not want a prelate, especially in the See of London, who, clothed in all the calm and lofty dignity of the episcopate, will, in measured accents, bid the surging waves of Ritualism observe the line which the Anglican Church, acting on the authority of the first four Councils, has laid down and marked out by Articles and Rubrics. It needs, rather, one who understands the difficulties of the situation, and is prepared to grapple with them; who sees where and how a strong breakwater may be erected, and has sufficient skill, resolution, and force to construct it; and who, if he cannot succeed in an attempt which would be confessedly difficult, at least secures respect by the ability and energy which mark a man of independent opinions and decided purpose.

Dr. Jackson may sigh over the evil fate which has cast his lot at such a juncture. He is pre-eminently a man of peace, and it is painful that he should be in a perpetual broil. "*Non quieta movere*" might well be his motto; yet, by a strange irony of fortune, he, the meek and dignified prelate, who desires nothing better than to be allowed to exercise his power in that gentle and accommodating spirit

which would be severe to none but those whose own dangerous and fanatical love of extremes threatens to undermine the foundations of rightful authority, and imperils the very security of the Establishment, is assailed on every side, and kept in a state of chronic agitation and disquiet. But may not the devoted sons of the Church, who believe that she is meant to be a power for the maintenance of the truth, complain with more reason on their side, that so responsible an office should be held by one who, with all respect be it spoken, has given so little proof of his competency for the right employment of the great influence it places in his hands? A strong Bishop of London, at the present time, might have done something towards lengthening the life of the Establishment, by showing that it did in some way or other fulfil its own ideal—either that it had a distinct creed to maintain, and knew how to maintain it, or that it had a basis so broad that it must include all diversities of opinion, and that the duty of its different schools of thought, therefore, was simply to dwell at peace with one another. Each of these courses would have its own peculiar difficulties, but consistency in an earnest endeavour to maintain either theory, especially if it was animated by a prudent and forbearing spirit, would have been an element of power.

But Dr. Jackson has pursued neither the one nor the other. If his policy has been tolerant, it has not been as the result of any desire to make the

Church comprehensive, but rather from the want of spirit and power to give effect to his own views. He cannot be freely accused of actual sympathy with Ritualism. Indeed, there can be no reasonable doubt that he would be rejoiced to suppress those excesses by which it shocks the Protestant feelings of the nation, and creates a scandal whose ultimate consequences it is impossible to predict, provided it could be done without turmoil or serious peril. But he has not the force necessary to interpose an effectual resistance to its aggressions, and his mode of encountering it only serves to foster that spirit of lawlessness in which it is ever making fresh encroachments. If it were possible, he would coax it into good behaviour, but to compel its obedience is as contrary to his taste as it is beyond his power. His professed rule is mere anarchy, by which a party who are nothing, if not strong-willed, do not fail to profit.

Some bishops impress us by a sublime sacerdotalism, whose ignorance makes it reckless; others by their strong party zeal; and others, again, by their absolute devotion to the Establishment, and the worldly wisdom with which they seek to uphold and extend its power. The Bishop of London gives us only the sense of feebleness. He is a sincere and conscientious man, of good intentions and of high principles, who is anxious to do right, and distressed at seeing so much around him going wrong, but who is simply unable to rise to the greatness of the occasion. If only Ritualists would

not be so imprudent, and Evangelicals so suspicious; if hot-headed incumbents would not provoke the anger of their parishioners by novelties too startling, or if churchwardens would not be so pertinacious in their opposition; if both parties would only remember that the Church to which they belong has always sought to preserve the golden mean, and, as her loyal children, would seek to do the same; if Nonconformists would keep their proper place, and thankfully accept the toleration they enjoy without indulging in rash and often unjustifiable criticism upon the Establishment, and still more, without seeking to overthrow it; if, in short, the restless fever of this age could be kept in check, and things be allowed to remain as they are at present—how happy would our good prelate be, and how gracefully would he adorn a society which thus appreciated the blessings of repose! But, unhappily for him, this is just what men will not do. The world will move. Men will put institutions, however venerable, upon their trial anew, and demand that they justify themselves by their works. Strong believers in great principles will press them to their results, and laugh to scorn the petty compromises by which it is sought to stay their progress. Ritualists will innovate, and Evangelicals will resist, and Nonconformists will point to their dissensions as proofs of the failure of the Establishment, and a bishop who has no power to keep these several elements in check will prophesy to them all in vain, and is in

no little danger of exposing both himself and his office to contempt.

What led Mr. Disraeli—who, to do him justice, has shown no little practical wisdom in his ecclesiastical appointments—to elevate Dr. Jackson, then Bishop of Lincoln, to the See of London is a puzzle. Perhaps he felt that as the promotion of Dr. Tait to the Primacy had naturally annoyed some of his supporters, it was necessary to satisfy them by putting in his place a man of sound Conservative instincts and moderate High Church tendencies. The then Bishop of Oxford was not available at the time, even if it would not have been too daring a step for a Minister who needed the support of all sections, to appoint a man so deeply committed to one. So the choice fell upon Dr. Jackson, who was filling the See of Lincoln with fair credit, though certainly his administration had given no indication of the qualities demanded by the higher position to which he was called. He had not attained any distinction either as a preacher or scholar. He had published a small volume of sermons on "The Sinfulness of Little Sins," which was extremely sensible and practical, and eminently characteristic. It certainly did not indicate a man who would be capable of dealing with grave difficulties, though it proved that he was possessed of qualities which, if plain and homely, and not implying any intellectual force, were, nevertheless, extremely valuable in every-day life. By this he had obtained a

certain reputation. He had managed the affairs of his diocese with discretion, and might probably have continued to do so to the general satisfaction of his clergy, if it had not been thought desirable to transfer him to a position where decision and strength were at least as requisite as prudence and moderation. No doubt even in his more obscure position it was possible for him to do more, but his peaceful character would probably have kept him from active mischief; his only fault is that in the more exalted one he is not capable of rendering the service that is demanded. He would never as Bishop of Lincoln have goaded the Wesleyans of the country into angry opposition to the Establishment; but the negative virtue, which is extremely valuable in the head of a country diocese, is a very small matter in London, where not to do good is to do harm.

But what, it may be asked, and not without a show of reason, is a bishop to do? He is often called upon for a vigorous exertion of his power, but no sooner does he attempt it than there is an immediate outcry against his arrogance and presumption, and even if he resolved to face this, it is not so clear what it is in his power to accomplish. He can only act in accordance with the law; and legal proceedings, especially in the Ecclesiastical Courts, are always costly and often disappointing in their results. Yet while there is a show of truth in these attempts to excuse the bishops, it is instinctively felt that they do not express the whole

truth, and that their lordships are not so utterly helpless as their apologists would represent them, or as they sometimes represent themselves. Their moral influence, strongly exerted, would have told for much, and there are innumerable ways in which their official power might have been employed, and in which it could not have been wholly ineffectual. But too many of them have graduated in the school of Mr. Facing-both-ways, and, by their hesitation and uncertainty, have succeeded in displeasing everybody, and discrediting themselves and the institution for whose safety they are so anxious. Certainly if the bishops can do nothing for the Church in such a crisis as this, the question will soon come to be asked, and asked with great justice, why should bishops exist at all. Leaders whom none will follow, overseers whose supervision has become a nullity, rulers whose sceptre has fallen from their nerveless grasp, chief pastors whose flock will not obey their voice, had better cease to wear the symbols and bear the name of a mock sovereignty.

Is not this the thought forced upon us by the contemplation of some of the Bishop of London's actions, or, to put it more correctly, by his failure to act? Take the case of the two Canons of St. Paul's, which, so far as the Bishop is concerned, is one of the most discreditable incidents of the Ritualist controversy. Even a powerful and determined bishop would not have found it a very simple thing to assert the rights of law against so

formidable a confederacy as that between the two Canons, and might have been excused if he had hesitated before he entered on a struggle sure to be long and difficult. But Dr. Jackson does not seem ever to have contemplated any action at all. Rebellion has therefore triumphed; the clergy have been able to assert their freedom from the law; and the Bishop of London is, to a very large extent, responsible for an issue which ultimately must be injurious both to the Church and State, and do more to sever their connection than much labour of the Liberation Society.

A still more recent example of the Bishop's mode of treating difficulties is seen in his reply to the memorialists relative to the Confessional—a reply which seems to have roused even some churchwardens to frenzy, and to have provoked Lord Shaftesbury to some utterances against both the Bishops and the Establishment. Such results can surprise no one who appreciates the importance of the points his lordship treats in such peculiar style. Anything more weak, more shuffling, more incommensurate with the gravity of the occasion, both in its general tone and practical suggestions, than the whole document, has seldom proceeded even from a trimming bishop. Of course Dr. Jackson does not attempt to justify "sacramental" or "habitual" confession, and endeavours to show that it is contrary to the teachings of his Church; but, as others of his brethren have done before him, he neutralises the force of all these

adverse statements by the concessions he makes and the general conclusions he reaches. The world had believed previously that there were a number of priests anxious to restore the Sacrament of Penance. They have, at all events, written and preached in its support; they have provided facilities in their churches for the practice of confession; and if they have not made it obligatory as a condition of admission to the Lord's Table, it has been because the law would not tolerate such an assumption of priestly power, not because there was any shrinking on their part from its assertion and enforcement. But the Bishop of London has discovered that it is with the laity, not the clergy, that the responsibility for the extension of this most mischievous piece of sacerdotalism rests. "The clergy are as often at least urged on by their congregations as the congregations are led by them. There would be few confessions if there were not many ready to confess." Quite true. "Like people, like priest," is the older form of the proverb, and it is as true as "Like priest, like people." Still it is a remarkable fact that this desire for confession should have so suddenly developed itself in this Protestant nation. Hitherto there has been no practice of the Romish Church more universally regarded with suspicion and aversion. It is, at least, singular if, without evident cause, the temper and tendencies of a considerable portion of the people should suddenly have undergone this radical change, and that without any cause they should

have begun to desire that which up to this time they have held in utter detestation. If there is a desire for confession it certainly has not been of spontaneous growth, but has been the fruit of seed long and carefully sown by the class of men who now ask permission to be legalised as confessors, and so to gather that which they had sown. But, after all that they have done, the idea that there has been such a change in public opinion as the Bishop would have us believe is simply absurd. If it were so, the suggestion that the rulers of the Church have nothing to do but acquiesce in the result to which it points is only another sign of imbecility. It has been a stock allegation against Dissent, that it allows the people to dictate to their teachers. But the Bishop of London, if he followed out the principles of this unfortunate reply, would allow a certain number of hot-headed laymen to override not only the clergy, but the bishops also.

The view which his lordship propounds of the position and duties of the laity might be intelligible if it had come from a Nonconformist, or even from a layman of independent spirit in the Church herself; but as coming from a bishop it is simply astounding. It might have been intended as a covert sarcasm both upon his office and upon the system of which it is a part. "Laymen may do much to discourage auricular confession by not sending their children to schools, however good the education in which it is practised, and by not sending them to churches, however beautiful the service,

in which it is taught." But the schools thus condemned are distinguished by their fervid loyalty to the Church, and are recommended by some of his lordship's colleagues on this very account; and of the churches from which laymen are to abstain, many are in his own diocese, and their clergy hold his license and are under his episcopal control. To what a condition has this boasted Church been reduced, and what amount of respect is it likely to command, when one of its prelates tells his laity that the one way of arresting the growth of a great spiritual evil is to abstain from certain places of worship connected with it, however beautiful the service in them! Dissenters have often been reproached because of their claiming the right to choose their own teachers; but here is a bishop positively enjoining his people to do the same, and telling them that it is to their wise discrimination between contending schools the Church must trust for her safety.

The question, however, which suggests itself is, what is to be the function of the bishops? Are they simply to speak comfortable words to soothe the feelings and repress the violence of too eager and excited partisans, to hold the rival sections in check, and yet to keep them in such good temper as to prevent such a secession of either from the Church as might bring about the downfall of the institution? The Bishop says, indeed (and under the circumstances perhaps we ought to feel grateful for even so much), that "it is incumbent on all ministers of the

Church, whether bishops or parochial clergy, to oppose the growth of this erroneous doctrine and practice;" but he reduces even the force of this by adding, with that fatal disposition to qualify everything which is the weakness of the school to which he belongs, "not so much perhaps by preaching controversially against confession — a procedure which rarely convinces any but those already convinced—but by inculcating, plainly, frequently, and patiently, backed as they will be by the whole weight of Scripture authority, the solemn obligation and privilege of each one's personal responsibility to God; the duty laid upon each of training his own conscience; the precious liberty which belongs to all God's adopted children, even though unworthy to be called His sons, of confessing all their sins to their Heavenly Father, through Christ, without the intervention of a human confessor, and of receiving from Him, for Christ's sake, full and free remission, whether it be or be not declared by a 'human confessor.'" But where is the Ritualist who would not accept all this? His error is, that he adds to it a great deal more which is of pure sacerdotal invention, and when the Bishop discourages controversial preaching, he in effect bids his clergy leave him unopposed in the carrying out of his own plans.

This mode of dealing with one of the most difficult subjects of the day is the more extraordinary, because when addressing his clergy in his last charge the Bishop's language about the practices

of the confessional was distinct and decided enough: "To those who remember the theology and practice of our Church for the last three hundred years, and who are aware of the fearful evils with which auricular confession has at least been credited, it will seem incredible that such teaching should find place and acceptance in the Reformed Church of England in the wane of the nineteenth century." But the question at once arises after reading this very clear utterance, followed by a long and elaborate exposition of the enforcement of this view, what is the Bishop doing to repress a practice as contrary, on his own showing, to the law of the Church as to the teaching of Scripture? and the answer must be, nothing. He reasons, expostulates, pleads, but he does not act. Confessors are being multiplied continually, and if there is any truth in the statement of the Ritualist party, they are all fully occupied. But there is not even an attempt to bring the law to bear upon them.

Possibly Dr. Jackson might say, as his brother at Winchester has said, that he has no power. But what is to be said of the positive encouragement he has given to the Romanising party by the appointment of Mr. Berdmore Compton to All Saints, Margaret-street. It has been urged in excuse for this nomination of a man of doubtful loyalty to a position where disaffection already existed and where his influence might be specially dangerous, that he has become more pronounced since his promotion, and that, in fact, he was a man of as

moderate High Churchism as would have been tolerated in that church. The latter plea really implies that the Establishment is divided into different sects, and that it would be as unwise to appoint an Evangelical to succeed a High Churchman as it would be, for example, to find the successor of an orthodox Trinitarian in a decided Socinian. The apology for the Bishop thus resolves itself into a condemnation of the Establishment, and, as a matter of fact, it is so in his case, as in that of many others. His Charge shows that he possesses a kindly heart, and a sound judgment on points where ecclesiastical influences do not come in to bias him. There is an amount of good sense and plain speaking in it which is not often found in such productions. But when we look for practical suggestions as to the way in which the Church may extricate herself from present difficulties, there is only miserable helplessness.

It is the sense of responsibility for the Establishment which hampers the Bishop. Perhaps he may sometimes wish that he had never deserted the humbler field of labour in St. James's, Piccadilly, where he proved himself so efficient as a parish priest, or at least had been contented with the comparative obscurity of Lincoln. But he is in London, where he is expected to be a statesman, and to deal with conditions often more puzzling than those with which our Prime Ministers have to deal.

He is not without resolution, and he shows it

when he can do it without endangering the Establishment. He was praised by a party who might not be expected to have much sympathy with him for refusing to concur in the movement against the appointment of Dr. Temple; but in any recognition of the manly line he took on that occasion it must not be forgotten that his action was just what the interests of the Establishment manifestly demanded. An extreme and decided procedure against Mr. Gladstone's nomination might easily have led to the explosion so often threatened, and which it is the business of all good bishops to stave off as long as possible. Dr. Jackson only obeyed the natural instinct of his order in this instance when he deprecated the adoption of an extreme course by his brethren.

A different opportunity for the display of strength presented itself when Mr. Fremantle was announced to preach at the City Temple. Here it was possible for him to strike with effect, and, what was better, without risk of any serious consequences either to himself or the Establishment. Nay, it might even serve to conciliate the Ritualists themselves, if they saw that their Bishop, though sometimes complaining of their excesses, was yet bent on maintaining the rights of the Apostolical Succession. The manner of doing it was peculiar, but it would be useless to criticise it, as the Bishop professed simply to act in accordance with the law. Such a desire to observe the law is all the more worthy of praise, because it is so extremely rare in

ecclesiastics. There are, no doubt, many other irregularities which the Bishop might, without much effort, discover in his diocese, quite as flagrant as the extreme liberality which he forbade in Mr. Fremantle. The repression of these will doubtless come in due course. In the meantime he may congratulate himself on what he has achieved. He has not silenced Mr. Mackonochie; he has not repressed the extravagances at St. Vedast's or at St. Mary Magdalene, or at Stoke Newington; he did not interfere with an exhibition at St. Alban's on Easter Sunday afternoon, which seems to have been more of the character of a religious comedy or raree-show than anything else; but he has prevented one of his clergy from preaching in a Nonconformist chapel. After that, no one can truly say that he is absolutely powerless. The advantages of such an exhibition of energy to the cause either of the Establishment or of Protestantism are not, however, very obvious.

In threatening Mr. Fremantle with legal proceedings if he should be guilty of the atrocious sin of preaching the Gospel in a meeting-house, Dr. Jackson showed only a becoming deference to the law, for which he would have received more credit if it had been in harmony with his general procedure. But the law was made for Canons Gregory and Liddon as well as for Canon Fremantle; and to break it in St. Paul's Cathedral in the interests of Anglican Catholicism—that is, of semi-developed Popery—is as bad as to transgress it in the City Temple for the

promotion of a true Catholicity. There is, too, this marked difference between the two cases. In the former, the Bishop has a declaration of the law from the highest ecclesiastical court, and assumes the right of dispensing with it until the case has been re-heard. In the latter, he acts upon his own view of the law—which may very probably be the true one, but has not as yet been positively laid down by the courts—and requires the intending offender to conform to it. Neither party will respect so one-sided an administration of law. The Bishop, no doubt, acted under a conscientious sense of duty; but it is a pity that his conscience should compel him to be so severe upon a solitary transgressor who shows a disposition to go too far in the direction of Protestant freedom and liberality, while he is so indulgent to more powerful and dangerous offenders, who cover with the shield of their high names and reputations the conspiracy which, as bishops have more than once assured us, is seeking to Romanise the Church of England.

Dr. Jackson himself may well have doubted the wisdom of his own procedure when he read the comments, whether eulogistic or otherwise, which it called forth. It was praised, of course, by all the High Church and Ritualistic organs, with whom the *Times* was then in accord. But even the Bishop must be a far more arrogant ecclesiastic than he is supposed to be, if he was not startled and shocked by the tone which these journals adopted. For any extravagance on the part of the Ritualist

press he was, of course, prepared; but the truculence of the *Times* was more surprising; and the Bishop must surely have felt some misgivings as to his own policy when he saw it fully developed in the proclamation of a natural hostility between the Establishment and Nonconformity with which the leading journal chose to enliven its columns on the occasion. Perhaps he may have been as little satisfied to find that he had the approval of the *Liberator*, which was not at all unwilling that the world should see the exclusive character of the Establishment.

That Dr. Jackson shares this spirit himself, no one who has read his last Charge can suppose. It shows a man hampered by his position, with the broader sympathies of a true Christian heart warped by Church principles and theories, and with his mind oppressed by the sense of the difficulties he discusses so carefully, but feels himself so unable to remove. He could have chosen no subject more suitable for his own position, as well as for that of the Establishment, than the one to which the Charge was devoted. He is a good man, who means to do right, but is a victim of those "present difficulties," in relation to which he so vainly attempted to instruct his clergy, because, in fact, they have proved too strong for himself.

UNWIN BROTHERS, PRINTERS, LONDON AND CHILWORTH.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018